# NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. | Without Concealment---Without Compromise. | JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, Corresponding Editor.

VOLUME IX.—NO. 19. | NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1848. | WHOLE NUMBER 435.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY
AT 143 NASSAU STREET NEW-YORK.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to the Editor.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. Gay, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—Two Dollars per annum: Strictly in advance in all cases.


## Selections.

SPEECH OF

### Hon. John A. Dix, of N. Y.

**On the Bill to establish Governments in the Territories. Delivered in the Senate of the United States, July 26, 1848.**

OREGON, NEW MEXICO, AND CALIFORNIA.

The bill to establish Territorial Governments in Oregon, New Mexico, and California, being under consideration—

Mr. DIX said:

*Mr. President*:—It is is with great reluctance that I throw myself on the indulgence of the Senate a second time in this discussion. But since I spoke, positions have been taken in the debate, and assertions made, which I cannot pass without comment; and especially am I unwilling to be silent when the whole subject is presented to us under a new phase by the report of the committee of eight, and brings up a train of considerations, having an important bearing upon the question.

Before I proceed to notice, as I shall very briefly, the provisions of the bill reported by the committee, I desire to say something on other topics which have been introduced into the discussion.

The northern States have been repeatedly charged in this debate, and on many previous occasions, with aggression, and violations of the constitutional compact in their action on the subject of Slavery.—With regard to the surrender of fugitive slaves—the case most frequently cited—it is possible that there may have been some action, or inaction, in particular States, not in strict accordance with the good faith they ought to observe in this respect. I know not how it is; but we know there is an effective power to legislate on this subject in Congress; and I am sure there will be no want of co-operation on our part, in carrying out the requirements of the constitution, by providing all reasonable means for executing them.

The senator from South Carolina, (Mr. Butler,) in the remarks he addressed to the senate yesterday, made repeated allusions to me in connection with the suggestion of a superior civilization in the non-slaveholding states. I have made no such suggestion. I have drawn no parallel. I have made no distinction, in this respect, between the north and the south. And in the case to which he particularly referred, and in which I spoke of "spires pointing to the skies," in language perhaps somewhat more flowery than I am accustomed to use, I expressly said that I made no distinction between the two great sections of the Union.

But this is a matter on which I shall not dwell. I am but an individual; and a misapprehension which concerns only myself, is comparatively of little importance. But when the senator, turning from me, assails the state I have the honour to represent; when the misconception does injustice to those who have given me their confidence, he wounds me in a more tender point, and I cannot pass his remarks by without a more extended notice.

Mr. President, I endeavoured to get the floor yesterday when the senator took his seat, and I made repeated attempts afterwards, in all of which I was unsuccessful. I wished to notice, at the moment, and on the spot, the imputations which he had cast on the State of New York, in language I regreted to hear from any senator on this floor. He said a requisition had been made, some years ago, on the Governor of the state by the Executive of Virginia, for the surrender of persons convicted of stealing a slave within the jurisdiction of the latter state; that the Governor had refused to surrender them, and that this refusal had been sustained by both branches of the Legislature; and on this statement he charged New York with a want of "common honesty." Sir, these are harsh epithets—epithets which should not have been applied to us without a full knowledge of the facts. The senator labours under a great misapprehension. The responsibility which he charged on the state, rests upon the Governor alone. The facts are these:

In 1841 a requisition was made by the Executive of Virginia on the Governor of New York, for three persons charged with stealing a slave in the former state. The Governor refused to surrender them, for the reason assigned in the following resolution which was adopted by both branches of the Legislature of New York, early in 1842:

"Whereas, the Governor of the state has refused to deliver up, on demand of the Executive authority of Virginia, Peter Johnson, Edward Smith, and Isaac Gansey, alleged fugitives from justice, charged with the crime of theft, viz: stealing a slave within the jurisdiction and against the laws of Virginia; and whereas the Governor has assigned as the reason for such refusal, that the stealing of a slave within the jurisdiction of and against the laws of Virginia, is not a felony or other crime within the meaning of the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States.

"Resolved, That, in the opinion of the Legislature stealing a slave within the jurisdiction and against the laws of Virginia, is a crime within the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States."

"Resolved, That the Governor be requested to transmit the foregoing preamble and resolution to the Executive department of Virginia."

These resolutions, as I have said, passed both branches of the Legislature. I am unable to state the vote; but I was then a member of the Assembly, and I remember that it passed that body by a very decided majority.

Thus it seems that the Legislature of New York, in both its branches, representing the people of the State in a double capacity—for the Senate was at that time the High Court for the Correction of Errors—the highest judicial tribunal in the State—disclaimed and condemned the act of the Governor, and left the responsibility to rest on him alone. Beyond this it could not go. The act to be performed was Executive, and the Legislature had no control over him to compel the performance.

But the Senator did not stop here. His speech was replete with reproachful allusions to New York, too indefinite to be met with a distinct reply; and he concluded by saying that he expected nothing good from her. Sir, there have been periods in the history of the country, when she was neither inactive or inefficient in her efforts for the public good. In 1837, when the whole banking system throughout the Union exploded; when the President of the Bank of the United States was putting forth manifestoes and employing the whole strength of the institution to continue the suspension of specie payments; and when, I believe I may say, most other portions of the Union were disposed to yield—New York stood almost alone in opposing it. She compelled her own banks to resume the discharge of their obligations under the penalty of a forfeiture of their charters; she became the centre of all that was sound in commerce and finance; and through the influence and the power of her example, the country was saved from years of dishonour and pecuniary embarrassment.

In 1814, when the whole southern coast was at the mercy of the public enemy, and portions of it ravaged and laid waste; when the Administration here was too weak to defend the capital; and when the very edifice in which we sit was given to the flames by British vandalism, New York stood again almost alone and unassisted, and carried on the contest upon her own frontier chiefly with her own means. She raised money and men, and contributed to sustain the honour of our arms in a series of the most desperate engagements ever fought on this continent.

Of her institutions, social and political, I need say nothing—the monuments she has reared to science, and to the arts, her great artificial channels of intercourse, and above all, her system of common school education, embracing every child that is born or is brought within her limits. These are well known to all who hear me; and they say for her more than any words of mine can speak.

Less than a year ago two noble-spirited bands stood, side by side, on one of the bloodiest battle-fields of Mexico. They were led on by chivalrous men, animated by the single resolution of upholding their country's honour and their own. They were the New York and the Palmetto regiments. The blows they gave fell upon the ranks of the enemy with equal force; those they received were sustained with equal firmness. More than a third of these gallant combatants fell together. The grass which has grown up rich and rank upon that battle-field, can tell where their blood was poured out in common streams. The noble leader of the Palmetto regiment was among the slain.*—borne from the field of carnage, perhaps, by the united hands of those whom he led, and those who, though coming from a distant part of the Union, fought by his side with the same devotion as his own followers. Sir, there should be something in these sacred memories to disarm reproach—at least of its injustice. Let me commend them to the calm reflection of the Senator from South Carolina, who has so deep an interest in the glory and grief of that battle-field. He is neither ungenerous nor unjust. Let me ask him to think of these things, and say whether some good may not come from New York.

But I pass to a charge more immediately connected with the subject under discussion—the application of the principles of the ordinance of 1787 to the Territories of the United States. This charge concerns the whole North, and I am ready to meet it.

In 1846 and 1847, most of the non-slaveholding States, on high considerations of moral and political principle, declared that no new territory ought to be acquired without a fundamental provision excluding Slavery. These declarations had an express and an exclusive reference to acquisitions from Mexico, where Slavery had long been abolished both by executive and constitutional acts. They amounted practically to declarations against the extension of Slavery to free territory, and no more. New York did not take the lead in these declarations. The first legislative resolutions received here came from the State of Vermont, and were presented to this body on the 28th of January, 1847. The New York resolutions were presented on the 6th of February ensuing; those of Pennsylvania on the 8th; of Rhode Island on the 10th; of Ohio on the 16th; of New Hampshire and New Jersey on the 19th; of Michigan on the 1st March; and of Massachusetts on the 3d—the last day of the session. Connecticut passed resolutions on the 24th of June; but Congress had then adjourned, and they were presented at the commencement of the subsequent session. Delaware, a slaveholding State, followed, and requested her Senators to vote for the exclusion of Slavery from territory thereafter to be acquired. Here are eleven States which have passed resolutions on this question. It was a spontaneous movement on the part of the non-slaveholding States, neither led on by New York nor set on foot by her, but arising out of indications in Congress of an intention to acquire territory from Mexico, and leave it open to the introduction of slaves; and every one knows they will be carried wherever they are permitted.

On looking at the dates of these several resolutions, I find New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania preceded New York, in the order in which I name them, in acting on this subject in their respective Legislatures. Three of the small New England States, which the Senator from Virginia, who spoke first on this question, [Mr. Mason,] would have us believe New York was seeking to seduce, and in the end to swallow up, were actually the pioneers in this movement. Pennsylvania was next in the field. New York did but follow and sustain them in their declarations against the extension of Slavery to territory in which it does not exist.

Such is the history of this movement, commencing as far back as July, 1846, almost coeval with the war with Mexico, and originating in a charge of intending to conquer territory for the purpose of planting Slavery upon it. And these public declarations may perhaps be properly regarded in a two-fold light, so far as motive, on the part of the Legislature, is concerned; first, to exonerate themselves from the imputation; and, second, to array their influence against such a design, if it should be entertained in any quarter.

Let me now take a somewhat larger view of this whole subject of northern aggression. It was said, I think, by a southern member of the Federal Convention, though it may have been in Congress after the adoption of the Constitution, that no slaveholding State would thereafter be admitted into the Union; that there were eight States interested in abolishing Slavery, and five interested in maintaining it, and that they would act accordingly in voting for the admission of new States. This prophecy had no foundation in truth. The members of Congress from the North have voted as freely and readily for the admission of slaveholding as for non-slaveholding States into the Union. If we look around us upon this floor, we shall find all prognostics founded upon the supposed prejudices or the unkind feeling of the North utterly falsified. Sir, there are ten Senators here representing slave-holding States formed from territory acquired since the Constitution was adopted. How many are there representing free States formed from new territory? Not a single one. But for a domestic difficulty in Iowa, it is true that State would have been represented here, and we should then have had two Senators from free States against ten from slaveholding States formed out of territory purchased by the common treasure and maintained by the common blood of the whole Union. We have given up the territory constituting these States to the South. We have reserved no portion of them to northern emigration, excepting the misshapen strip of Texas north of 36 30, which, so far as extent and productive value are concerned, is, for all purposes of a fair and equitable division, the merest mockery.—The area of these five States is equal to two-thirds of the entire area of the thirteen original States.—This the north has done for the maintenance of Slavery—Sir I might say for the extension of Slavery and the multiplication of Slaves: for this vast surface was almost uninhabited when it was acquired, and it is now filled up with a slaveholding population. There are more than half a million of slaves in these five States, not one-tenth part of whom would have been there, if the right to exclude them had been insisted on. But we have stood on the ground of non-interference. When we have found Slavery, we have left it. We have not countenanced any measure of abolition or emancipation. On the contrary, we have uniformly opposed all interference with Slavery in the states.—With the single exception of the Louisiana territory, we have left it to spread itself over the areas on which it existed only nominally. We have almost gone, at the north, to the extreme of mobbing abolitionism, when it contemplated interference with the question of Slavery in the States, and of instituting a scrutiny of the public mails to arrest the circulation of incendiary publications. And now, after all this active co-operation in the promotion of the objects and interests of the slaveholding States, how are we met? By charges of aggression, of hostility, and of violating the constitutional compact.

Sir, we stand firmly upon the compromises of the Constitution. We have ever done so. We shall continue to do so. We have gone further. We have opposed all interference by Congress with Slavery in the District of Columbia, over which Congress is empowered by the Constitution to "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever." Beyond this we cannot go. I deny that any compromise in framing the Constitution, or any guarantee arising under its provisions, extends, or was designed to extend, to the regulation of Slavery in the Territories. What were the compromises of the Constitution? They were three: 1. That the small States should be equally represented in the Senate with the large States. 2. That the slave population in the States should constitute a part of the basis of representation in Congress. 3. That the importation of slaves into the States then existing should not be prohibited prior to 1808. These were the three great compromises on which the adoption of the Constitution may be considered as having turned.—In settling them, some reference was naturally had to the distribution and regulation of the powers vested in the Federal Government and reserved to the States and the people respectively.

Now, sir, what was the security sought for by the South in the adoption of these compromises? Was it that Congress should impose no restriction on the extension of Slavery to the Territories? No, sir.—That power I have no doubt was left, so far as it was contemplated at all, to be exercised by Congress, according to its own views of humanity and justice. I humbly think this construction is sustained by what I said on a former occasion. It is shown also by the deed of the cession by North Carolina of Western territory now constituting the State of Tennessee, in which it was provided, "that no regulations made, or to be made, by Congress, shall tend to emancipate slaves"—a prohibition implying a right to regulate, restrict, and exclude them.

The Senator from Florida, [Mr. Westcott] read to the Senate yesterday the *fac simile* of an original paper found among the manuscripts of Mr. Monroe, and in his handwriting, by which it appears, that when the Missouri compromise act, as it is called, was passed, he took the opinions of the members of his Cabinet, in writing, in respect to the Constitutionality of the act. The Senator from South Carolina, [Mr. Calhoun,] was one of the Cabinet; and as I took, and endeavoured to sustain, on a late occasion, the position that Congress possesses the right to prohibit Slavery in the territories of the United States, I am naturally desirous of fortifying it with all the authority I can command; and I shall be particularly gratified, if it shall be found that the distinguished Senator alluded to, though now denying the right, was then in favour of it. I will read to the Senate all of this paper which relates to the subject:

(From Mr. Monroe's manuscripts.)—A paper endorsed "*Interrogatories, Missouri—March 4, 1820. To the Heads of Departments and Attorney General.*"

Questions. (on opposite page:)

"Has Congress a right, under the powers vested in it by the Constitution, to make a regulation prohibiting Slavery in a Territory?

"Is the eighth section of the act which passed both Houses on the 3d instant, for the admission of Missouri into the Union, consistent with the Constitution?"

With the above is the original draft of the following letter, in President Monroe's hand-writing, on half a sheet of paper, but not endorsed or addressed to any one. There are interlineations, but the text, as left by the writer, is as follows:

"DEAR SIR:—The question which lately agitated Congress and the public, has been settled, as you have seen, by the passage of an act for the admission of Missouri as a State, unrestrained, and Arkansas likewise, when it reaches maturity, and the establishment of 36 30 north latitude as a line, north of which Slavery is prohibited, and admitted to the South. I took the opinion, in writing, of the Administration as to the Constitutionality of restraining territories, [*and the vote of every momber was unanimous and**] which was explicit in favour of it, and as it was that the 8th section of the act was applicable to territories only, and not to States when they should be admitted into the Union. Of this latter point I had at first some doubt; but the opinion of others, whose opinions were entitled to weight with me, supported by the sense in which it was viewed by all who voted on the subject in Congress, as will appear by the Journals, satisfied me respecting it."

This letter has been supposed to have been written to Gen. Jackson, though there is no evidence of the fact.

*Mr. Foote*—Were these interrogatories sent or was it merely a statement for his own private convenience?

*Mr. Dix*—It is impossible to say, except so far as the paper may be considered as indicating the use made of them. I state the facts as they have been related to me. The paper was found among Mr. Monroe's manuscripts, and is in his handwriting. It was read to the Senate yesterday by the Senator from Florida, [Mr. Westcott,] for another purpose, and the evidence of its authenticity I understand to be in his possession.

*Mr. Calhoun*—If the Senator will give way, it will be, perhaps, better that I make a statement at once respecting this subject, as far as my recollection will serve me. During the whole period of Mr. Monroe's administration, I remember no occasion on which the members of his administration gave written opinions. I have an impression—though not a very distinct one—that on one occasion they were required to give written opinions; but for some reason not now recollected, the request was not carried into effect. He was decidedly opposed to the imposition of any restriction on the admission of Missouri into the Union, and I am strongly of the impression that he was opposed in feeling to what was called the Missouri compromise.

*Mr. Johnson*, of Maryland—Is this the original letter?

*Mr. Dix*—I understand it to be a *fac simile* of the original. As a long period (nearly thirty years) has elapsed since the act to admit Missouri into the Union was passed, it is quite natural that the Senator from South Carolina should have forgotten the circumstances attending the discussion of it in the Cabinet. Having heard, some days ago, of the existence of such a paper, and being very desirous of ascertaining the facts, I wrote to Mr. Charles F. Adams, of Boston, a son of the late ex-President, inquiring of him if his father's diary contained anything on the subject. In reply to my inquiry, I received an extract from the diary of the father, certified by the son, which I will now read, and which confirms fully the statement contained in Mr. Monroe's letter:

*Extracts from the diary of Mr. J. Q. Adams.*

"MARCH 3, 1820.—When I came this day to my office, I found there a note requesting me to call at one o'clock at the President's House. It was then one, and I immediately went over. He expected that the two bills, for the admission of Maine and to enable Missouri to make a Constitution would have been brought to him for his signature; and he had summoned all the members of the Administration to ask their opinions in writing, to be deposited in the Department of State, upon two questions: 1. Whether Congress had a Constitutional right to prohibit Slavery in a territory? and 2. Whether the 8th section of the Missouri bill (which interdicts Slavery *forever* in the territory north of 36½ latitude) was applicable only to the territorial State, or would extend to it after it should become a State? As to the first question, it was unanimously agreed that Congress have the power to prohibit Slavery in the territories."

This is the first extract; and before I proceed to the others, I will state that, in respect to the second question, there was a diversity of opinion—Mr. Adams contending that a State would be bound by such a prohibition after its admission into the Union, and the other members of the Cabinet, that it was only operative during the territorial term. In order to secure unanimity in the answers, the second question was modified, as will appear by the remaining extracts which I proceed to give:

"MARCH 5.—The President sent me yesterday the two questions in writing, upon which, he desired to have answers in writing, to be deposited in the Department of State. He wrote me that it would be in time, if he should have the answer to morrow. The first question is in general terms, as it was stated at the meeting on Friday. The second was modified to an enquiry, whether the 8th section of the Missouri bill is consistent with the Constitution. To this I can without hesitation answer by a simple affirmative, and so after some reflection I concluded to answer both. * * *

"MARCH 6.— * * * I took to the President's my answers to his two constitutional questions, and he desired me to have them deposited in the department, together with those of the other members of the Administration. They differed only as they assigned their reason for thinking the 8th section of the Missouri bill consistent with the Constitution, because they considered it as only applying to the territorial term; and I barely gave my opinion, without assigning for it any explanatory reason. The President signed the Missouri bill this morning."

These extracts are certified to be "a true copy from the original by me

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS."

*Mr. Calhoun*—Has any search been made in the State Department for these written opinions?

*Mr. Dix*—The State Department has been examined—how thoroughly I do not know—but they have not been found.

*Mr. Westcott*—I made an examination, as I stated yesterday, myself, but could find none. The letter is in Mr. Monroe's handwriting, and from its tenor is supposed to have been intended to be addressed to General Jackson. I understand that upon examination of General Jackson's papers, a letter was found from Mr. Monroe, containing everything which is contained in this draught, except that part which relates to the action of the cabinet. The letter was also dated the same day I presume, therefore, that upon writing the letter to General Jackson, ultimately, unless it was intended for some one else, Mr. Monroe left out that portion relating to the action of the Cabinet in relation to the "Missouri Compromise."

*Mr. Dix*—I have examined the letter referred to, as addressed to General Jackson, and find that it was written in 1821, while the paper containing the interrogatories was dated the 4th of March, 1820; and the former has only two of the last paragraphs of the letter before us; all the rest being different.

*Mr. Calhoun*—If any written opinion was ever given by me, it has entirely escaped from my memory; and I feel satisfied, if ever given, it was very little more than an assent or dissent to the course adopted by the Administration. Mr. Adams had the advantage of keeping a diary, which no doubt may be relied upon, as far as he is individually concerned; but which, of course, is liable to mistakes, as far as it represents the views and acts of others. In this case there may be some explanation, if all the facts were known, which would reconcile his statement with my recollection. But of one thing I feel perfectly sure, that I could never have directed my attention and formed an opinion on so important a subject, as a member of his Cabinet, and reduced it to writing, for the purpose of being preserved, without recollecting it.

*Mr. Johnson*, of Maryland, was understood to say that on examining the letter, he did not think it sustained the fact the Senator from New York was endeavouring to prove. He observed that Mr. Monroe had first stated that the opinion of the Administration was *unanimous*, and that he had erased the word unanimous, and substituted the word *explicit*, which had quite a different meaning.

*Mr. Calhoun*—I feel justified in saying, from all the circumstances of this case, including the facts stated by the Senator from Maryland, and the absence of any written opinion on the file of the State Department, that notwithstanding the certificate of Mr. Adams's diary, no such opinions were given as it states. There is some mistake about it, but how it originated I am at a loss to conceive. Perhaps it may be explained by the vague impression, as I have stated, on my mind, that the opinions were called for, but never formally given in writing, at least not beyond a mere assent or dissent as to the course ultimately adopted. I know well all about the compromise; the cause which led to it, and the reason why, that the Northern men who voted against it were universally sacrificed for so doing. It is quite a mistake, as some suppose, that they were sacrificed for voting for the compromise. The very reverse is the case. The cause I will proceed to state: During the session of the compromise, Mr. Lowndes and myself resided together. He was a member of the House of Representatives, and I was Secretary of War. We both felt the magnitude of the subject. Missouri, at the preceding session, had presented herself for admission as a member of the Union. She had formed a Constitution and Government, in accordance with an act of Congress. Her admission was refused on the ground that her Constitution admitted of Slavery: and she was remanded back to have the objectionable provision expunged. She refused to comply with the requisition, and at the next session again knocked at the door of Congress for admission, with her Constitution as it originally stood. This gave rise to one of the most agitating discussions that ever occurred in Congress.—The subject was one of repeated conversation between Mr. Lowndes and myself. The question was, what was to be done, and what would be the consequence if she was not admitted? After full reflection, we both agreed that Missouri was a State made so by a regular process of law, and never could be remanded back to the territorial condition. Such being the case, we also agreed that the only question was, whether she should be a State in or out of the Union? and it was for Congress to decide which position she should occupy. My friend made one of his able and lucid speeches on the occasion; but whether it has been preserved or not, I am not able to say. It carried conviction to the minds of all, and in fact settled the question. The question was narrowed down to a single point. All saw that if Missouri was not admitted, she would remain an independent State on the west bank of the Mississippi, and would become the nucleus of a new confederation of States extending over the whole of Louisiana. None were willing to contribute to such a result: and the only question that remained with the Northern members who had opposed her admission was, to devise some means of escaping from the awkward dilemma in which they found themselves. To back out or compromise, were the only alternatives left; and the latter was eagerly seized to avoid the disgrace of the former—so eagerly, that all who opposed it at the North were considered traitors to that section of the Union, and sacrificed for their votes.

*Mr. Foote*—The gentleman referred to, and from whose journal an extract had been read, as is well known, has been always regarded as a most violent partizan of the peculiar views he held in relation to this subject. I beg leave most respectively to inquire of the honourable Senator of New York, whether this statement or extract read has been sworn to or not?

*Mr. Dix*—The statement was, as I have said, taken from the diary of Mr. Adams, certified but not sworn to, by his son, a gentleman of the highest respectability.

I do not intend to enter into any discussion concerning the Missouri compromise, or the testimony I have presented. I leave it to speak for itself, and to others to say how far it shall be considered to outweigh the recollections of the Senator from South Carolina. I will only add, that there is the strongest possible coincidents between Mr. Monroe's letter and Mr. Adams's diary in all the important facts. Both state the question to have been "in writing;" both show that they were submitted in the shape in which they were to be answered, on the 4th of March, 1820. The identity of the question is another striking coincidence. The only material variation is that suggested by the Senator from Maryland.—Mr. Adams states, that the opinion of the members of the Cabinet was "unanimous" in favour of the power of Congress to prohibit Slavery into the territories of the United States. Mr. Monroe wrote "unanimous" in the first instance, and then substituted "explicit," as an alteration he might very naturally have made, on reflection, in writing to a friend, in order to avoid giving a clue to the opinion of individual members of his Administration. The answers were very brief, as Mr. Adams shows; but from the manner in which the questions were drawn, the answers, whether affirmative or negative, must either have asserted or denied the Constitutional power of Congress to prohibit Slavery in the Territories. But all this I am willing to submit to the candid judgment of others.

Let me now cite a few of the remarks made in the Federal Convention on the subject of Slavery and Slave representation. On the 12th of July, Mr. Randolph, of Virginia, said, "That express security ought to be provided for including Slaves in the ratio of representation. He lamented that such a species of property existed; but as it did exist, the holders of it would require this security. It was perceived that the design was entertained by some of excluding slaves altogether; the Legislature, therefore, ought not to be left at liberty."

In the Convention of Virginia, by which the Constitution was ratified, Governor Randolph entered into an elaborate argument to show that Congress had no right to abolish Slavery in the States. It was feared that under the power of prohibiting the slave trade, or under the power to regulate commerce, or under some implied power, Slavery within the limits of the States might be interfered with by Congress.

On the 13th of July, Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, said: "The security the Southern States want is, that their negroes may not be taken from them, which some gentlemen within or without doors have a very good mind to do."

This was the tenor of the discussions in the State Conventions by which the Constitution was ratified. They look to security from abolition or emancipation by Congress within their own limits. Extension of Slavery beyond their limits was hardly thought of; and I have no hesitation in saying, from the tone of the debates, that if it had been fully discussed, it would have been to brand it with general disapprobation.

On the 22d of August, a very full and interesting debate arose in the Federal Convention the onquestion of prohibiting the importation of slaves. The only objects contended for in any quarter were the right to import them and an exemption of the States from all interference with Slavery within their own limits on the part of the Federal Government. It was generally conceded, except by the extreme south, that Slavery would ultimately be abolished. And yet the slave population has gone on steadily increasing, from 600,000 to 3,000,000 of souls: and now we are engaged in a struggle to enlarge the area of Slavery, or to prevent its exclusion from territory in which it does not exist.

*Mr. Calhoun.* I must beg the senator from New York to state me more correctly. We are not contending for the extension of the area of Slavery and if he places us upon that ground, he places us in a very false position. What we do contend for is, that the southern States, as members of our Union are entitled to equal rights and equal dignity, in every respect, with the northern; and that there is nothing in the Constitution to deprive us of this equality, in consequence of being slaveholders.

Mr. *Dix.* The senator contends for the right of carrying slaves into the Territories. I understand this to be an extension of Slavery, and, with all deference to him, I can call it by no other name.

In connection with this subject, we were asked by the senator from Virginia, whether any one believes that State would ever have come into the Union, if the right to exclude slaves from the territories had been insisted on? I answer, yes; and on the strength of the known opinions of her delegates in the Convention.

Mr. Madison would not consent "to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in men." He was unwilling to postpone the prohibition of the slave trade twenty years. "So long a term," he added, "will be more dishonourable to the American character than to say nothing about it in the Constitutions." His language and his action then, and on all occasions, were in favour of the restriction of Slavery, and not in favour of its extension. The opinion of General Washington the President of the Convention, on the subject of Slavery, is well known. I have already referred to the opinion of Mr. Randolph. Colonel Mason was still more decided and explicit. His language may be quoted now with the more effect, when those who have come after him differ with him so widely in opinion:

"This infernal traffic originated in the avarice of British merchants. The British Government constantly checked the attempts of Virginia to put a stop to it. The present question concerns not the importing States alone, but the whole Union. The evil of having Slaves was experienced during the late war. Had Slaves been treated as they might have been by the enemy, they would have proved dangerous instruments in their hands; but their folly dealt by the Slaves as it did by the Tories. * * * * * Maryland and Virginia (he said) had already prohibited the importation of Slaves expressly; North Carolina had done the same in substance. All this would be in vain, if South Carolina and Georgia be at liberty to import. The western people are already calling out for Slaves for their new lands, and will fill that country with Slaves, if they can be got through South Carolina and Georgia. Slavery discourages arts and manufactures. The poor despise labour, when performed by Slaves; they prevent the emigration of whites who really enrich and strengthen a country. * * * As the States being in possession of the right to import, this was the case with many other rights now to be properly given up. He held it essential, in every point of view, that the General Government should have power to prevent the increase of Slavery."

To this declaration in the Federal Convention, I might add, that in the Convention of Virginia, he alleged, as one of the objections to the Constitution, that it continued the slave trade for twenty-two years.

The Senator from Virginia wears, with equal dignity and grace, the name of the illustrious statesmen I have quoted. It is quite probable that there is a closer bond of connection between them* But how different is their language, and the causes they have espoused at the distance of more than half a century from each other! The patriot of the Revolution denounced the British Government for forcing slaves upon Virginia against her remonstrances. The Senator from that State is contending here, in her name, for the right to carry slaves into Oregon, against the wishes and prohibitions of the inhabitants.

But to return from this digression. The four distinguished individuals I have named constituted a majority of the delegation from Virginia, and I believe I am authorized, from their avowed opinions, to say, that if there had been a positive provision in the Constitution authorizing Congress to prohibit the introduction of slaves into territories thereafter to be acquired, it would not only not have been deemed an impediment to the accession of Virginia to the Union, but that it would have met their decided approbation. But in this case, as in many others, the framers of the Constitution fell far short of the reality, when they looked forward to the future progress of the country. The period in which they lived was enveloped in uncertainty and doubt; and it was only reserved to a few of the more sanguine to obtain some partial glimpses of the prosperity and fame to which their country was destined. It was the only limited foreknowledge of her growth and extension, which left so many of the exigencies we have met unprovided for by direct and positive regulation.

Mr. President, it was chiefly in the school of Virginia that the little knowledge I possess of the theory of our institutions, and of the principles of political liberty and justice, was acquired. I have been accustomed to regard Mr. Jefferson as a standard, to which we might safely refer for the settlement of most questions of political power and duty; and it is with something more than ordinary pain and regret that I have seen his principles assailed, and his acts repudiated and condemned.

I was not a little surprised, too, to hear the Senator from Virginia rest the legal justification of Slavery upon the right of conquest, and its introduction into that State during her colonial dependence on the common law of England. I had supposed that Blackstone had furnished sufficient evidence of the mistaken pretensions which had been set up on both these foundations to support the fabric of Slavery in the American colonies and their successors, the States. I hold in my hand a volume of the English commentator, edited by St. George Tucker, who was a professor of law in the University of William and Mary, and one of the judges of the General Court of Virginia. To this volume is appended an article or tract written by him, "On the state of Slavery in Virginia."—Sir, it is in this edition of the writings of the great English commentator that many of us of the north have studied the principles of English law, and from the tracts, which are appended to the several volumes, that we have learned to consider Virginia as the great enemy of Slavery extension. I propose to read a few extracts from this volume, to show how widely different are the grounds now assumed and those on which the young men of Virginia, and of the country generally were instructed, half a century ago, in the principles of political liberty and justice.

And, first, as to the origin of Slavery. Judge Tucker quotes largely from Blackstone, denying that Slavery rests either upon the law of nations, by which, according to Justinian, "one man is made subject to another contrary to nature," or upon captivity or conquest, or upon the civil law, by which a man may suffer himself to be sold "for the sake of sharing the price given for him." He then proceeds:

"Thus, by the most clear, manly, and convincing reasoning, does this excellent author refute every claim upon which the practice of Slavery is founded, or by which it has been supposed to be justified, at least in modern times. But were we even to admit, that a captive taken in a *just war* might by his conqueror be reduced to a state of Slavery, this could not justify the claim of Europeans to reduce the natives of Africa to that state. It is a melancholy though well-known fact, that in order to furnish supplies of those unhappy people for the purposes of the slave trade, the Europeans have constantly, by the most insidious (I had almost said infernal) arts, fomented a kind of perpetual warfare among the ignorant and miserable people of Africa; and instances have not been wanting, where by the most shameful breach of faith, they have trepanned and made slaves of the sellers as well as the sold. That such horrid practices have been sanctioned by civilized nations; that a nation ardent in the cause of liberty, and enjoying its blessings in the fullest extent, can continue to vindicate a right established upon such a foundation: that a people who have declared, 'That all men are by nature equally free and independent,' and have made this declaration the first article in the formation of their Government, should, in defiance of so sacred a truth, recognized by themselves in so solemn a manner, and on so important an occasion, tolerate a practice incompatible therewith—is such an evidence of the weakness and inconsistency of human nature, as every man who hath a spark of patriotic fire in his bosom, must wish to see removed from his own country. If ever there was a cause, if ever an occasion, in which all hearts should be united, every nerve strained, and every power exerted, surely the restoration of human nature to its inalienable right, is such. Whatever obstacles therefore may hitherto have retarded the attempt, he that can appreciate the honour and happiness of his country, will think it time that we should attempt to surmount them."

Such, according to Judge Tucker, is the foundation on which Slavery in Virginia and in the other States rests—not on conquest, not on any right derived from legitimate warfare, but on violence and treachery. I do not cite this authority to create prejudice of any sort. My only purpose is to meet arguments on the other side.

The common law of England utterly repudiated Slavery. To use the language of one of her great commentators, "the law of England abhors, and will not endure, the existence of Slavery within this nation." In the colonies it was introduced by virtue of the prerogative of the Crown, as the fountain of chartered rights, and as the arbiter of commerce. Nothing, I believe, is better settled in English law than this. Slavery was at one time, it is true, regulated by act of Parliament, rather by recognizing the laws of the colonies than by original legislation; but the common law always rejected it as unnatural and unjust.

Virginia uniformly acted in accordance with the elevated sentiments expressed by Judge Tucker. She imposed duties on Slaves brought within her limits as early as 1699—one hundred and fifty years ago. In 1759, she imposed a duty of 20 per cent on all Slaves imported from Maryland, North Carolina, or other places in America. In 1772, she petitioned the King of England to allow her to prohibit the importation of Slaves from Africa. I quote from the petition:

"The importation of Slaves into the colonies from the coast of Africa, hath long been considered as a trade of great inhumanity, and under its *present encouragement*, we have too much reason to fear *will endanger the very existence* of your Majesty's American dominions.

"We are sensible that some of your Majesty's subjects of Great Britain may reap emoluments from this sort of traffic; but when we consider that it greatly retards the settlement of the colonies with more useful inhabitants, and may in time, have the most destructive influence, we presume to hope, that the *interest of a few* will be disregarded, when placed in competition with the security and happiness of such numbers of your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects.

"Deeply impressed with these sentiments, we most humbly beseech your Majesty to *remove all those restraints* on your Majesty's Governors of this colony, *which inhibit their assenting to such laws as might check* so very pernicious a commerce."

Judge Tucker says:

"This petition produced no effect, as appears from the first clause of our Constitution, where, among acts of misrule, 'the inhuman use of the royal negative,' in refusing us permission to exclude Slaves from us by law, is enumerated among the reasons for *separating from Great Britain*."

The clause in the Constitution of Virginia is in these words:

"Whereas, George the Third, King of Great Britain and Ireland, and Elector of Hanover, heretofore intrusted with the exercise of the Kingly Office in this Government, hath endeavoured to pervert the same into a detestable and insupportable tyranny, putting his negative on laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good;" (Here follows an enumeration of other acts;) by prompting our negroes to rise in arms against us—those very negroes whom, by an inhuman use of his negative, he hath refused us permission to exclude by law."

Judge Tucker adds:

"The wishes of the people of this colony were not sufficient to counterbalance the interest of the English merchants trading to Africa, and it is probable, that however disposed to put a stop to so infamous a traffic by law, we should never have been able to effect it, so long as we might have continued dependent on the British Government; an object sufficient of itself to justify revolution."

And now, sir, I ask, will Virginia insist on extending to other communities an evil which she deplored, and thus be guilty of an act which she considered, when done by the British King, as a sufficient justification of revolution?—an act enumerated in the first clause of her Constitution among the reasons for separating from Great Britain? Mr. Jefferson, as we all know, introduced into the original draught of the Declaration of Independence a clause reprobating the conduct of the British King in forcing Slaves upon the American colonies; but it was struck out, to use his own language, "in complaisance to South Carolina and Georgia, who had never attempted to restrain the importation of Slaves, and who, on the contrary, still wished to continue it." Sir, are we willing to do towards other communities dependent on us what we condemned in the British King?—what we relied on as one of the grounds of our justification in appealing to the sword for a vindication of our rights and the assertion of our independence? What matters it to the inhabitants of Oregon, or New Mexico, or California, whether Slaves are introduced from Africa or from the States of the Union in which they are bred? Sir, let us abstain from this injustice and wrong. If we insist on carrying slaves to those territories; if the arm of the public authority is employed, directly or indirectly, for the purpose of placing them there, and in uprooting, in two of the territories, the fundamental law of Mexico, which declares Slavery to be forever prohibited—it would not be surprising if, in the progress of events, when those distant communities shall have grown to manhood, that they, like us, should declare themselves "free and independent; and among the causes of the separation, charge us, as we charged the British King, with forcing Slavery upon them, against their wishes and their remonstrances. If this was a just cause of separation for us, why would it not be so for them? God forbid that history should record such a passage as this, to confound and shame our descendants.

It has been said, that this territory should be divided, so that a portion of it may be left open to the introduction of slaves; that it has been acquired by the common treasure and the common blood of the whole Union, and that it would be unjust to exclude a portion of the citizens of the Union from it.

In the first place, I do not admit that there would be any exclusion if Slavery were prohibited. It would be open to every freeman in the community. But even on the score of an equitable division—if the propriety of such a division could be admitted, when the question is, whether laws abolishing Slavery shall be abrogated—I hold that the territory should be, as it now is, free. When Florida was acquired, we did not ask that any portion of it should be set apart for immigration from the free States. We claimed no division. We gave it all up to the South. And yet it was purchased by the common blood and the common treasure of the whole Union. The soil of Florida has been crimsoned by the blood,

non-slaveholding States, and see how their surface compares with that of the slaveholding. What is their area, Mr. President? But little more than one hundred thousand square miles—not half the geographical extent of the slaveholding. Thus, with an area not half as great as that of the slaveholding States, the Free States are charged with aggression and injustice, because they will not consent to the extension of Slavery beyond its present limits into districts of country in which it does not exist. And what is more extraordinary, we are accused of inhumanity, because we propose, to use the language of our accusers, "to pen up" the African race on an area nearly a million of square miles in extent!! Really, this subject is hardly susceptible of being treated with becoming gravity; and I dismiss it.

Let me now look a moment at the provisions of this bill, so far as they profess to offer us a compromise of the question of Slavery in the Territories. And here I desire to say, that I intend no reflection upon the conduct or motives of the committee, collectively or individually. I deal only with the measure; but of that I must speak freely and frankly.

There are but two direct references to Slavery in the bill; they are contained on the twenty-sixth and thirty-third sections and both are to the same purport.—They prohibit the territorial governments of California and New Mexico from legislating on the subject.

There is one indirect reference to Slavery. It is contained in the twelfth section of the bill, which declares the laws now in force in Oregon to be valid and operative for three months after the Legislative Assembly meets; and, as we all know, one of these laws prohibits Slavery.

These, then, are the great provisions of this bill.—They leave the whole of New Mexico and California open to the introduction of slaves, and prohibit the territorial governments from legislating on the subject, even if disposed to legislate for their exclusion. And, in consideration of this abandonment of all the territory we have acquired from Mexico to Slavery, we have received from the hands of the committee the boon of freedom for three months in Oregon. This is the great concession to the non-slaveholding States; and this is presented to us as a compromise—a compromise which surrenders everything on one side, and concedes nothing on the other. Let me pursue this subject, by examining some of the propositions with which this bill was ushered into the Senate chamber by the Senator from Delaware, (Mr. Clayton,) as chairman of the committee of eight. They are so extraordinary, that I cannot forbear to pay them a passing notice. I hold them to be a true exposition of the meaning and object of the bill by the one who, of all others, is best qualified to interpret it—the one by whom it was drawn. I give the more credence to this interpretation of it, because on a more careful examination of it, I can put no other construction on it myself.

The first proposition is this: (I read from his remarks)

"While it was admitted on all sides that by far the greatest portion of the territories was properly adapted to free labour, and would necessarily be free soil forever; yet it was also, *with equal unanimity conceded* that there was a portion of it where *free labour* could never be introduced, owing to the climate and the peculiar productions of that portion."

I consider this proposition unsound in all its parts. In the first place our own experience teaches us that slaves will be carried wherever they are permitted to go; that no soil will be free where they are not excluded by law. They were taken into the territory northwest of the Ohio river. There are now five slaveholding States north of 36 deg. 30 min.; Missouri, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia and Kentucky. On a former occasion, I said that slaves would be valuable in any part of the country, in the early stages of settlement, where the demand for labour is urgent. And I have no hesitation in saying, that if this bill passes both Houses, and becomes a law, they will be carried into every part of New Mexico and California which is inhabitable. This will be its practical effect. Even if the northern portion shall in future years abolish Slavery, it will be left with a black population—a burden and incumbrance to the whole white race, and an impediment to its moral and physical development.

But the latter part of the proposition is far more objectionable than the first; and I regret exceedingly to hear that it was conceded with unanimity. I deny that there is any portion of these territories where free labour can never be introduced. I deny that there is any portion of the globe which nature designed for Slavery. It would be an impeachment of the character and the purposes of the great author of the Universe to concede that there is any portion of the earth in which we cannot "stand fast in the liberty" wherewith God has made us free. I deny that there is any portion of Oregon, or New Mexico, or California, to the cultivation of which slave labour is indispensible. The suggestion is as unsound in fact as it is in philosophy. I do not admit that there is any portion of those territories to which African, much less than slave labour, is indispensible. There is no portion of it less suited to white labour than the southern portion of Spain—none which has a more fiery sun than Andalusia—where Slavery does not exist. Besides, there is a free Indian population, natives of the climate, willing to work, singularly docile, and adequate to all the demands for labour for years to come.

I regret exceedingly to have heard the admission that slave labour is necessary in these territories. But I have ceased to be surprised at anything from any quarter. I have heard one of the principles of the Declaration of Independence impugned, and its author charged with error in advocating the exclusion of Slavery from the territories of the United States. I have heard negro Slavery defended as founded in right, as justified by the laws of God, and lauded as "the mildest species of bondage which labour ever bore to capital on the face of the globe." I confess I have been astonished at these declarations, so different from all I have heard and read of the sentiments of the great men of the Republic from its foundation to the present day. I have been taught, and taught by the South, to regard Slavery as an evil to be got rid of, and not as a good to be communicated to other communities.

The Senator from Delaware, after proposing to organize Governments for California and New Mexico, by the appointment of a Governor, Secretary, and Judges, to compose a temporary legislature, without the power to legislate on the subject of Slavery, proceeds: "It was thought, that by this means Congress would avoid the decision of this distracting question, leaving it to be settled by the silent operation of the Constitution itself; and that, in case Congress should refuse to touch the subject, the country would be slaveholding only where, by the laws of nature, slave labour was effective, and free labour could not maintain itself!"

This proposition is subject to the great and fundamental objection I have taken to the other. It contains a direct admission, that by the laws of nature a portion of the country or territory will be slaveholding. I deny that nature has any such law. It is the law of man, doing violence to all the dictates of nature, that makes a country slaveholding, either by its own voluntary act, or by the act of others forcing Slavery upon it.

But the chief and radical objection is, that it contains a further admission that the territories are to be left open to the introduction of slaves—that they will be slaveholding wherever slaves can be carried. It is an admission that the "silent operation of the Constitution" will be to make the country slaveholding, where slave labour will be effective. I consider it an entire abandonment of Northern ground. What is the ground taken by the North? It is, that Slavery shall be prohibited in the territories. The act contains no such prohibition. It is a complete surrender to the theories and claims of our friends of the South. All they contend for is, that the territories shall be open, and they left to the unrestricted enjoyment of the right they assert to carry their slaves into any territory belonging to the United States. This is the very extent of their demands. It leaves nothing for them to ask or desire. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Calhoun] commenced his speech with the assertion that all the South desired was—no legislation. This has been conceded—fully conceded.—Indeed, something more has been given up. It was not enough to yield all that was asked. The Territorial Government is prohibited from legislating on the subject of Slavery. This I should not object to, constituted as that Government is likely to be, but for a single consideration—as a precedent, it may be of importance. It will constitute an argument in favour of extending the same prohibition to the legislative assemblies, when they shall be hereafter created. But I will not look beyond the present. I take it as it is. The territorial Government is prohibited from legislating; Congress does not legislate; and Slavery will extend itself over the whole—of New Mexico and California. It will enter the great basin; it will take possession of the maritime valley of California—the American Italy; and when planted there, neither you, Sir, nor I, nor our children, will live to see it eradicated.

And with this assurance, which no man can reasonably doubt, we are invited to leave this matter "to the silent operation of the Constitution;" when we all know that the Constitution does no more than vest in Congress the power to legislate for the Territories. It is an invitation to us to leave this power unexercised, and to let Slavery extend itself wherever self-interest can carry it. It is the same interest that was used in the Federal Convention against the abolition of the slave trade. Our fathers were invited to leave the whole subject to the laws of nature. It is the argument which has been employed on all occasions to resist every attempt to prevent the extension of Slavery. It was urged against restrictions upon Louisiana, against restrictions upon the territory northwest of the Ohio River, against restrictions upon the territory west and northwest of the Mississippi, when Missouri was admitted into the Union. Did those who have gone before us yield to these persuasions of self-interest? No, sir, they refused to accede to them. They prohibited the introduction of slaves into the Territories. They considered it as a political question, proper only to be decided by themselves, and not to be shuffled off upon the Judiciary. They met the responsibility like men, and decided it according to the dictates of duty and right. This scheme of the committee, so far as it professes to be a compromise, secures nothing to the North. To the South it yields up all. It concedes all that is asked, all that is desired. It imposes no restriction; it sets up no barrier; it leaves the whole field open to be entered and taken possession of, unresisted and unopposed. It is an unconditional surrender; it has not even the grace of a capitulation upon terms.

If gentlemen suppose this proposition will calm the prevailing excitement, they are greatly mistaken. What does it contain calculated to allay agitation at the North? Does it concede anything to the non-slaveholding States? No, Sir. It excludes Slavery nowhere—not even in Oregon. It only continues her prohibition in force for three months after the first meeting of her Legislative Assembly. The prohibition is then to cease. From that moment slaves may be introduced, unless the prohibition is reenacted. They will not be excluded then, if Congress should disapprove the reenactment. Oregon comes here with an organic law prohibiting Slavery forever; and we throw it back upon her with a mere temporary vitality. We virtually invite her to reconsider it, as if it had been passed without due reflection, or as if, on further deliberation, she may think it advisable to receive slaves into her bosom. Indeed, it is not necessary for her to do any act. She has only to be passive. We virtually repeal the prohibition. And this the committee give us to calm excitement! Sir, I consider this whole scheme of legislation unworthy of the high character of the country, unworthy of our fathers, unworthy of ourselves. It is commended to us, that Congress may avoid the decision of the question. It is an evasion of responsibility, which will defeat its own purpose. It is sowing the seeds of a future agitation, vastly more profound and exciting than this. It is a temporary colonization of this controversy, to be sent out to the Pacific to stir up discussion among the first settlers, and then to be brought back here, after a time, to renew agitations among ourselves. It will turn out, like every other device of timidity, which shrinks from one embarrassment only to plunge deeper into another.

But, Sir, we have reason to be thankful that our case is not utterly void of hope. We are flattered by the Chairman of the Committee with the assurance that Congress will be at liberty hereafter to give us the Missouri Compromise, and run out the line of 36 deg. 30 min. to the Pacific. He considers the arrangement temporary.

It is not so with the Senator from South Carolina, [Mr. Calhoun.] He has pronounced it permanent. And, what is eminently worthy of attention, the bill was to speak for itself. It was so announced. Well, Sir, it has spoken for several members of the committee; and it is so artfully or so inartificially contrived, that it speaks a totally different language in each case.

But let us pause and survey this bow of promise which the Chairman of the Committee has hung out in the distance for our encouragement and hope—the Missouri Compromise. When it presents itself, I shall be opposed to it—utterly, irreconciliably; because it will extend Slavery where it does not exist; because it would subvert the laws of Mexico which have abolished Slavery, and introduce it where it is prohibited. It bears no analogy to the Compromise of 1820. That settlement of the question, which was confined to Louisiana, contracted the area of Slavery. This would extend it. The whole of Louisiana was open to the introduction of slaves. Slavery nominally existed there. But beyond the limits of the State of Missouri, north of 36 deg. 30 min. the territory was nearly uninhabited. The Compromise invaded no right. It was no act of abolition or emancipation; but it prohibited the extension of Slavery to areas over which, without such a prohibition, it would have been extended. How widely different is this proposition! It is to extend Slavery where, without the sanction of the public authority, direct or indirect, it cannot go or exist. It is a proposition to establish Slavery by law in a district of country more than two hundred thousand square miles in extent, equal to the entire area of France and the Spanish peninsula. On every principle of justice and right I shall be opposed to it; justice to ourselves, to our national character, and to the future millions who are to occupy the great Pacific, or maratime valley of California—literally the Italy of America, in all but the monuments and classical recollections of the other. Let us look at this question practically. The proposed Compromise would carry out the line of 36 deg. 30 min. to the Pacific, and prohibit Slavery north of it. Let us see the geographical divisions it would make. It would divide New Mexico just above Santa Fe, leaving that city and two-thirds of the entire State or Territory to the South. How is the distinction between free and slave territory to be maintained? Are we to have two Territories with separate political organizations, or only one with an astronomical line separating the bond from the free? Passing New Mexico, the compromise line would cross the Sierra Madre, or Rocky Mountain chain, and enter a district but little explored, but, so far as known, barren and almost worthless—leaving a strip of three parallels of latitude to the South. It would next graze the great basin of California—one of the most remarkable features, in the geographical conformation of this continent—represented by Fremont as Asiatic rather than American in its character. It is five hundred miles in extent in all directions, enclosed by mountains—the Sierra Madre on one side and the Sierra Nevada on the other—and has its own systems of lakes and rivers. It is for the most part sterile, but with numerous and in some cases extensive tracts capable of cultivation. Passing the great basin without touching it, the compromise line would cross the Sierra Nevards, and enter the maritime valley of California, five hundred miles in length and one hundred and fifty in width from the summit of the mountain chain, which forms its eastern boundary, to the coast range on the Pacific. This valley—the finest in the Western hemisphere—is represented by Fremont as bearing a close resemblance to Italy in extent, in climate, and in its capacity for production. It is the natural region of the vine and the olive, and of the infinite variety of grains and fruits which the earth brings forth in tropical climates. Though much farther north, it has all the mildness of the tropical regions on the eastern face of this continent. The compromise line would sever this noble valley latitudinally, leaving four hundred miles to the North one hundred to the South. It yields nothing, to the production of which slave labour is necessary. Slavery would go there as a bane and a hinderance, rather than as an aid, even to production. Why, then, seek to introduce it, when no good purpose is to be answered—when it can only prove an element of unmixed evil? Why sever a region which nature designed for unity in its geographical conformation, its climate, soil and capacity for production? How is the social distinction which the compromise line would introduce to be preserved inviolate? Will you have two Governments or one with an imaginary line to define the boundary between Slavery and Freedom? Sir, this whole scheme of division is wrong in all its elements—geographically, politically, morally wrong—and I will have no part in it.

Such, Mr. President, would be the Missouri compromise line, applied to New Mexico and California. Bad as it would be, the bill reported by the committee is still worse. It leaves all open; it surrenders all. It will dedicate the whole of this noble valley to Slavery, and exclude from it the freemen of the North, who will not go where their labour is to be degraded by mingling it with the labour of blacks. Sir, there were gallant bands from the North and West, who "coined their hearts and dropped their blood for drachmas" on the ensanguined plains of Mexico, to make this acquisition. They are gone beyond the reach of sympathy on the one hand, or injustice on the other. But against their fathers and their children, you will by this act put forth an edict of perpetual exclusion from an inheritance purchased by filial and paternal blood.

There is another consideration which ought not to be overlooked. We have been accused, for the last two years, of making war on Mexico to obtain territory for the extension of Slavery. We have denied the truth of these imputations. We have resented them as doing injustice to our intentions. And yet, Sir, the treaty is hardly ratified before we are engaged in a struggle in the American Senate to extend Slavery to the territory we have acquired. How can we stand up, in the face of a civilized world, and deny these imputations, if the proposition of leaving these territories open to the introduction of slaves is consummated?

I do entreat our Southern friends earnestly, solemnly, not to press this measure upon us; I mean that of insisting on the right to carry slaves into New Mexico and California. I say to you in sincerity and with the deepest conviction of truth of what I say, that the Northern feeling can go no further in this direction. I appeal to you, through the memory of the past, to do us the justice we have rendered to you. You asked for Florida. You said it shut you out from the Gulf of Mexico. It was an inlet for political intrigue and social disorganization. It was necessary for your safety. We united with you to obtain it. Our blood, our treasure was freely shared with you in making the acquisition. We gave it up to you without reserve. You asked for Texas. It was said to be in danger of falling under the control of our commercial rivals. You said it would become a theatre for the intrigues of abolitionism. Your slave population might be endangered without it. We united with you again, and gave you back, by legislation and arms, what you had lost a quarter of a century before by diplomacy. We have now acquired free territory. We ask only that it may remain free. Do not ask us to unite with you in extending Slavery to it. We abstain from all interference with Slavery, where it exists. We cannot sanction its extension, directly or indirectly, where it does not exist. And if the authority of the United States is exerted for this purpose—if Slavery is carried into and established, as it will be by this bill, in the territory we have acquired—I am constrained to say—I say it in sorrow—the bond of confidence which unites the two sections of the Union will be rent asunder, and years of alienation and unkindness may intervene before it can be restored, if ever, in its wonted tenacity and strength. Not that I have any present fears of the integrity of the Union. I have not. It is capable of sustaining far ruder shocks than any possible settlement of this question can give. But what I fear is, that the current of reciprocal kind confidence, which runs through every portion of the community, pervading, refreshing, invigorating all, may be turned out of its course, and forced into channels to which the common feeling is alien, and in which it may be converted into a fountain of bitterness and strife. I conjure you, then, to avoid all this. Ask us not to do what every principle we have been taught, and taught by our fathers, to venerate, condemns as unnatural and unjust.

From the North Star.

## AN ADDRESS TO THE COLOURED PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

FELLOW COUNTRYMEN:—Under a solemn sense of duty, inspired by our relation to you as fellow sufferers under the multiplied and grievous wrongs to which we as a people are universally subjected,—we, a portion of your brethren, assembled in National Convention, at Cleveland, Ohio, take the liberty to address you on the subject of our mutual improvement and social elevation.

The condition of our variety of the human family, has long been cheerless, if not hopeless, in this country.—The doctrine perseveringly proclaimed in high places in church and state, that it is impossible for coloured men to rise from ignorance and debasement, to intelligence and respectability in this country, has made a deep impression upon the public mind generally, and is not without its effect upon us. Under this gloomy doctrine, many of us have sunk under the pall of despondency, and are making no effort to relieve ourselves, and have no heart to assist others. It is from this despond that we would deliver you. It is from this slumber we would rouse you. The present, is a period of activity and hope. The heavens above us are bright, and much of the darkness that overshadowed us has passed away. We can deal in the language of brilliant encouragement, and speak of success with certainty. That our condition has been gradually improving, is evident to all, and that we shall yet stand on a common platform with our fellow countrymen, in respect to political and social rights, is certain. The spirit of the age—the voice of inspiration—the deep ongings of the human soul—the conflict of right and wrong—the upward tendency of the oppressed throughout the world, abound with evidence complete and ample, of the final triumph of right and wrong, of freedom over Slavery, and equality over caste. To doubt this, is to forget the past, and blind our eyes to the present, as well as to deny and oppose the great law of progress, written out by the hand of God on the human soul.

Great changes for the better have taken place and are still taking place. The last ten years have witnessed a mighty change in the estimate in which we as a people are regarded, both in this and other lands. England has given liberty to nearly one million, and France has emancipated three hundred thousand of our brethren, and our own country shakes with the agitation of our rights. Ten or twelve years ago, an educated coloured man was regarded as a curiosity, and the thought of a coloured man as an author, editor, lawyer, or doctor, had scarce been conceived. Such, thank Heaven, is no longer the case. There are now those among us, whom we are not ashamed to regard as gentlemen and scholars, and who are acknowledged to be such, by many of the most learned and respectable in our land. Mountains of prejudice have been removed, and truth and light are dispelling the error and darkness of ages. The time was, when we trembled in the presence of a white man, and dared not assert, or even ask for our rights, but would be guided, directed, and governed, in any way we were demanded, without ever stopping to enquire whether we were right or wrong. We were not only slaves, but our ignorance made us willing slaves. Many of us uttered complaints against the faithful Abolitionists, for the broad assertion of our rights; thought they went too far, and were only making our condition worse. This sentiment has nearly ceased to reign in the dark abodes of our hearts; we begin to see our wrongs as clearly, and comprehend our rights as fully, and as well as our white countrymen. This is a sign of progress; and evidence which cannot be gainsayed. It would be easy to present in this connection, a glowing comparison of our past with our present condition, showing that while the former was dark and dreary, the present is full of light and hope. It would be easy to draw a picture of our present achievements, and erect upon it a glorious future.

But, fellow countrymen, it is not so much our purpose to cheer you by the progress we have already made, as it is to stimulate you on to still higher attainments. We have done much, but there is much more to be done.—While we have undoubtedly great cause to thank God, and take courage for the hopeful changes which have taken place in our condition, we are not without cause to mourn over the sad condition which we yet occupy.—We are yet the most oppressed people in the world. In the Southern States of this Union, we are held as slaves. All over that wide region our paths are marked with blood. Our backs are yet scarred by the lash, and our souls are yet dark under the pall of Slavery. Our sisters are sold for purposes of pollution, and our brethren are sold in the market, with beasts of burden. Shut up in the prison-house of bondage—denied all rights, and deprived of all privileges, we are blotted from the page of human existence, and placed beyond the limits of human regard. DEATH, moral DEATH, has paleied our souls in that quarter, and we are a murdered people.

In the Northern States, we are not slaves to individuals, not personal slaves, yet in many respects we are the slaves of the community. We are, however, far enough removed from the actual condition of the slave, to make us largely responsible for their continued enslavement, or their speedy deliverance from chains. For in the proportion which we shall rise in the scale of human improvement, in that proportion do we augment the probabilities of a speedy emancipation of our enslaved fellow countrymen. It is more than a mere figure of speech to say, that we are as a people, chained together. We are one people—one in general complexion, one in a common degradation, one in popular estimation. As one rises, all must rise, and as one falls all must fall. Having now, our feet on the rock of freedom, we must drag our brethren from the slimy depths of Slavery, ignorance, and ruin. Every one of us should be ashamed to consider himself free, while his brother is a slave. The wrongs of our brethren, should be our constant theme. There should be no time too precious, no calling too holy, no place too sacred, to make room for this cause. We should not only feel it to be the cause of humanity, but the cause of Christianity, and fit work for men and angels. We ask you to devote yourselves to this cause, as one of the first, and most successful means of self-improvement. In the careful study of it, you will learn your own rights, and comprehend your own responsibilities, and, scan through the vista of coming time, your high, and God-appointed destiny. Many of the brightest and best of our number, have become such by their devotion to this cause, and the society of white Abolitionists. The latter have been willing to make themselves of no reputation for our sake, and in return, let us show ourselves worthy of their zeal and devotion. Attend Anti-Slavery meetings, show that you are interested in the subject, that you hate Slavery, and love those who are labouring for its overthrow. Act with white Abolition Societies wherever you can, and where you cannot, get up Societies among yourselves, but without exclusiveness. It will be a long time before we gain all our rights; and although it may seem to conflict with our views of human brotherhood, we shall undoubtedly for many years be compelled to have institutions of a complexional character, in order to attain this very idea of human brotherhood. We would, however, advise our brethren to occupy memberships and stations among white persons, and in white institutions, just so fast as our rights are secured to us.

Never refuse to act with a white society or institution because it is white, or a black one, because it is black. But act with all men without distinction of colour. By so acting, we shall find many opportunities for removing prejudices and establishing the rights of all men. We say avail yourselves of *white* institutions not because they are white, but because they afford a more convenient means of improvement. But we pass from these suggestions, to others which may be deemed more important. In the Convention that now addresses you, there has been much said on the subject of labour, and especially those departments of it, with which we as a class have been long identified. You will see by the resolutions there adopted on that subject, that the Convention regarded those employments though right in themselves, as being nevertheless, degrading to us as a class, and therefore, counsel you to abandon them as speedily as possible, and to seek what are called the more respectable employments.—While the Convention do not inculcate the doctrine that any kind of needful toil is in itself dishonourable, or that coloured persons are to be exempt from what are called menial employments, they do mean to say that such employments have been so long and universally filled by coloured men, as to become a badge of degradation, in that it has established the conviction that coloured men are only fit for such employments. We therefore, advise you by all means, to cease from such employments, as far as practicable, by pressing into others. Try to get your sons into mechanical trades; press them into the blacksmith's shop, the machine shop, the joiner's shop, the wheelwright's shop, the cooper's shop, and the tailor's shop.

Every blow of the sledge hammer, wielded by a sable arm, is a powerful blow in support of our cause.

Every coloured mechanic, is by virtue of circumstances, an elevator of his race. Every house built by black men, is a strong tower against the allied hosts of prejudice. It is impossible for us to attach too much importance to this aspect of the subject. Trades are important. Wherever a man may be thrown by misfortune, if he has in his hands a useful trade, he is useful to his fellow man, and will be esteemed accordingly and of all men in the world who need trades we are the most needy.

Understand this, that independence is an essential condition of respectability. To be dependent, is to be degraded. "Men may indeed pity us, but they cannot respect us." We do not mean that we can become entirely independent of all men; that would be absurd and impossible, in the social state. But we mean that we must become equally independent with other members of the community. That other members of the community shall be as dependent upon us, as we upon them. That such is not now the case, is too plain to need an argument. The houses we live in are built by white men—the clothes we wear are made by white tailors—the hats on our heads are made by white hatters, and the shoes on our feet are made by white shoe-makers, and the food that we eat, is raised and cultivated by white men. Now it is impossible that we should ever be respected as a people, while we are so universally and completely dependent upon white men for the necessaries of life. We must make white persons as dependent upon us, as we are upon them. This cannot be done while we are found only in two or three kinds of employments, and those employments have their foundation chiefly, if not entirely, in the pride and indolence of the white people. Sterner necessities, will bring higher respect.

The fact is, we must not merely make the white man dependent upon us to shave him, but to feed him; not merely dependent upon us to black his boots, but to make them. A man is only in a small degree dependent on us, when he only needs his boots blacked, or his carpet bag carried; as a little less pride, and a little more industry on his part, may enable him to dispense with our services entirely. As wise men it becomes us to look forward to a state of things, which appears inevitable. The time will come, when those menial employments will afford less means of living than they now do. What shall a large class of our fellow countrymen do, when white men find it economical to black their own boots, and shave themselves. What will they do when white men learn to wait on themselves? We warn you brethren, to seek other and more enduring vocations.

Let us entreat you to turn your attention to agriculture. Go to farming. Be tillers of the soil! On this point we could say much, but the time and space will not permit. Our cities are overrun with menial labourers, while the country is eloquently pleading for the hand of industry to till her soil, and reap the reward of honest labour. We beg and entreat you, to save your money—live economically—dispense with finery, and the gaities which have rendered us proverbial, and save your money. Not for the senseless purpose of being better off than your neighbour, but that you may be able to educate your children, and render your share to the common stock of prosperity and happiness around you. It is plain that the equality which we aim to accomplish, can only be achieved by us, when we can do for others, just what others can do for us. We should therefore, press into all the trades, professions and callings, into which honourable white men press.

We would in this connection, direct your attention to the means by which we have been oppressed and degraded. Chief among those means, we may mention the press. This engine has brought to the aid of prejudice, a thousand stings. Wit, ridicule, false philosophy, and an impure theology, with a flood of low blackguardism, come through this channel into the public mind; constantly feeding and keeping alive against us, the bitterest hate. The pulpit too, has been arrayed against us. Men with sanctimonious face, have talked of our being descendants of Ham—that we are under a curse, and to try to improve our condition, is virtually to counteract the purposes of God!

It is easy to see that the means which have been used to destroy us, must be used to save us: The press must be used in our behalf: aye! we must use it ourselves; we must take and read newspapers; we must read books, improve our minds, and put to silence and to shame, our opposers.

Dear Brethren, we have extended these remarks beyond the length which we had allotted to ourselves, and must now close, though we have but hinted at the subject.—Trusting that our words may fall like good seed upon good ground; and hoping that we may all be found in the path of improvement and progress,

We are your friends and servants,

(Signed by the Committee, in behalf of the Convention)

FREDERICK DOUGLASS,
H. BIBB,
W. L. DAY,
D. H. JENKINS,
A. H. FRANCIS.

## OUTRAGE AT FRIENDS' MEETING.

Cherry St. meeting was on First day last made the theatre of a new outrage on free speech and the rights of conscience, which, from its relation to the Anti-Slavery question, is a legitimate subject for report and comment in the Freeman; though we carefully abstain from interfering with ordinary sectarian difficulties and collisions. From a friend who was present, and in whose memory and candor we have the fullest confidence, we have learned fuller particulars of this affair than are given in the Ledger's account which we copy. Our excellent and conscientious friend Elijah F. Pennypacker, was present, and a short time after the meeting had settled into the quiet, he arose and in a serious, kind, and impressive tone and manner, spoke in substance as follows: (Of course, as the report is brief, and is made from memory, it may vary from the precise phraseology of the speaker.) "I do not expect," said he, "to say many words, but I believe I have some important truths to present for the consideration of the meeting. My mind has been occupied with *the misdirection of the human mind*, by which man's veneration and devotion are excited toward organizations and conventional laws, rather than the truth of God in his own soul, and men are led to tolerate and patronize legalized and popular crimes, while they denounce individual sins.

"For example: There is a universal abhorrence, among men, of the crimes of murder and stealing; if a man commits murder, public sentiment everywhere condemns him; but let that man act as the instrument of the government, to kill, not one man alone, but many—to commit wholesale murder—and he is honoured, and the people seek to promote him to the highest offices of the nation, even though his killing is in a war for the extension of Slavery. So the public sentiment condemns the individual thief, however trifling his theft, but if the government licenses or sanctions the robbery, then the infant may be torn from its cradle, men and women may be bought and sold on the auction block with impunity. Then men call the crime an "organic sin," and tolerate or protect it without reproach.

"To rob on the high seas is piracy, and none of our shelves are loaded with the fruits of this robbery; but if the wrong be by authority of the law, and upon the land, we can not only look upon it with toleration, but partake of its fruits; thus our shelves are groaning under the weight of goods plundered from the slaves' unpaid toil. Would this be if we revered the light of truth in our own souls, above human laws and conventionalisms? if like Christ we listened to the voice of our Father and the revealings of truth within us instead of established usages and popular customs? In this veneration for human conventionalisms, men falsify their own principles and professions. Thus the authors of the Declaration of Independence affirmed that "all men have an inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and then gave the lie to their assertion in the organization of their government, by their sanctions of life-taking and Slavery. Not only in the political, but in the religious world is this evident. From the time of Moses downward, the history of the Church has illustrated this. Moses brought from Sinai the law "Thou shalt not kill," yet in his own government he commanded, "If a man curse father or mother, he shall die," and "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, shall be put to death." George Fox and his followers taught man's equality, and that God was himself the teacher of his people, and so long as they practised these principles and trusted to the inward light, they were preserved in love and prospered; but they too have fettered and limited themselves with disciplines and conventional rules, and have begun to venerate established forms above the revealing of truth in the soul, and we see the results. Are we not now putting our organic law above the light of truth? If we regarded truth as our all sufficient guide, and mankind as an equal brotherhood, why these partitions? Why these high seats? Why our select meetings and privileged officers?"

During these remarks, which were spoken with great earnestness and sincerity of manner, there had been evident uneasiness among some of the "rulers in Israel;" and at this point, *Clement Biddle* rose and requested the speaker to sit down, remarking that when he began he had promised to speak but a few words—which, by the way was a mistake.

*James Mott* remarked that the friend was not only a member of the Society but of this Quarterly meeting, and hoped that he would be allowed to relieve his mind without interruption. This expression, however, was not heeded, as James Martin immediately joined his request to Clement Biddle's, that the speaker should sit down, and at the same time counselled patience among the members; advice at that time peculiarly needed on the "high seats." This interruption and overbearing attempt to stifle free speech, of course, caused much excitement and confusion. Several of the friends expressed their desire for Friend Pennypacker to go on. Geo. Truman suggested that there would probably have been no confusion in the meeting had not the speaker been interrupted, and hoped he would be permitted to go on.

Owing to the fainting of a woman the disorder at this stage increased, and the meeting was broken up by some of the elders.

Thus, a man universally beloved and revered by those who know him, for his gentleness of spirit, his integrity of character, benevolence of heart, and soundness of mind; an irreproachable member of that Society, whose pure life is an ornament to his professions—was silenced in this own Society. Had Elijah F. Pennypacker spoken thus in any political, social or religious meeting in Phoenixville, (near which he resides,) we believe he would have been heard with respect; for however men may dislike his opinions, they there know and esteem him too well to lay a finger upon those lips, which always breathe blessings and speak words of love.

Had those Quaker elders intended to illustrate and enforce the opinion of the speaker, of the unchristian, despotic nature of their office, they could not have done it more forcibly. It was natural that unprejudiced minds should feel grieved and indignant at this outrage, and sympathize with its victim. Of one such instance in the present case we will speak.

At the close of the meeting, a stranger who afterwards made himself known as a wealthy and liberal Catholic from Kentucky, came to Friend Pennypacker, and in a dignified but cordial manner, offered him his hand, and expressed much sympathy and gratification with his remarks, especially with his views of war and peace, and great surprise and regret at the manner in which those sentiments were received. What a reproof is this to professed Quakers, that a Roman Catholic outdoes them in liberality, and devotion to the peculiar testimonies of the Society of Friends! If the Popes and Cardinals of the Romish Church or the English clergy ever exhibited a more tyrannous spirit, they surely deserved all the anathemas which Fox and the early Quakers pronounced against them.—*Pennsylvania Freeman.*


# The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK OCTOBER 5, 1848.


Chance has thrown in our way a stray number of the "Christian Observer," a religious newspaper published in Philadelphia, and devoted to the Presbyterian interest, though whether of the "Old" or "New" school, we are not enough of a Theologian to determine. As far as we are able to judge from the number before us, the paper is conducted with as much liberality as is consistent with its sectarian character. It contains a very fair account of the Womans' Rights Convention (though prefaced by a vulgar paragraph, evidently from another hand), and speaks of Abolitionists with a civility sufficiently rare in religious journals.

There are one or two articles in it on which we propose to make a few comments. Our leading text will be a letter from the Rev. Dr. Bullard of St. Louis, Missouri, who is anxious that committees of ecclesiastical bodies, appointed to draw up reports upon the subject of Slavery, should visit the South and reside there three years, at least, in order to divest their minds of prejudice in the matter. The Doctor complains of the credulity of Abolitionists. Credulity we should be inclined to call an active faculty, rather than a mere passive quality of the mind, since we see it every day diligently exerted in precisely the opposite manner from that which has alarmed Dr. Bullard, for the swallowing, namely, of all kinds of pro-slavery fallacies and absurdities. But, whether a faculty or a quality, we confess that we have not enough of it to believe that the davs of an investigating committee would be very long in the land of Missouri. The initiatory steps of their pious enterprise would, no doubt, be agreeable enough. Probably Dr. Bullard would invite them to dinner. Perhaps some of his wealthier parishioners might do the same. And then we imagine them sallying forth, full of benevolence, to prosecute their inquiries among the "servants." We know not whether railroads are particularly plenty in Missouri, but we have a strong impression that there is a species of *impromptu* rail-carriage, a gratuitous conveyance by which is sometimes, with a too boisterous hospitality, even forced upon persons conducting investigations of the kind we are speaking of. We can fancy Dr. Bullard (who seems to be a kind-hearted man) walking beside the triumphal car of his Northern friends, like Philip beside the chariot of the Ethiopian, but, unlike Philip, modestly declining to share in so ostentatious an elevation, and exhorting them to take a calm and unprejudiced view of the country through which they were passing. It is only ten years since two persons had their ears cropped for entering into private conversation with "servants" in Dr. Bullard's own city of St. Louis, and we frankly admit that a committee of enquiry who went thither to obtain information on the subject of Slavery from anybody, except the masters, could afford an abbreviation in those organs as conveniently as anywhere else. Dr. Bullard may flatter himself that his committee would be treated with respect on account of their cloth, but we cannot even leave him so small a ground for confidence as that. It was only the other day that a clergyman, and one, moreover, whom Providence had furnished with a full natural suit of the theological colour, was sold in Kentucky, for fear he *might* possibly enter into conversation with that very class who are to form the subject of our supposed committee's investigations.

Dr. Bullard seems desirous to discuss the matter in a reasonable frame of mind, and we shall, therefore, endeavour to make a few suggestions for his reasoning faculty to exercise itself on. What objects would a committee propose to itself in making a visit to Missouri? To convince itself of the odious *injustice* of Slavery? It seems to us that a journey of twelve or fourteen hundred miles is hardly necessary for that. Dr. B. virtually admits it in his own letter. Should the committee make its expedition, then, to obtain material for the chapter in its report devoted to *cruelty*? There are thirty thousand living instances of it (according to Mr. Burt of South Carolina) at this moment in Canada. Do men run away from kindness? Has Dr. B. himself any notion of taking flight from St. Louis? His parish must be careful that they do not make too much of him, or they may drive him to seek refuge in Canada West.

Our worthy Doctor would, no doubt, admit that there is no necessity for making any reports at all on what is termed the *abstract* question of Slavery. With our friend Mr. Hosea Biglow, he is probably

"Willin a man should go tol'lable strong
Agin wrong in the abstract, *for that kind o' wrong*
*Is ollers unpop'lar and never gits pitied,*
*It bein' a crime no one never committed*;"

but, like that gentleman also, he would add the qualifying remark,

"But he mustn't be hard on particklier sins,
Cos that would be kickin the people's own shins,"

which, as the Doctor's experience in the pulpit must have taught him, is an exercise less profitable than exhilarating. We wish to bring this matter clearly before the mental eye of the Doctor, for whom, as an evidently amiable man, we have a sort of liking, if he will allow such a feeling on the part of an *ultra* Abolitionist. The Doctor, then, admits that "Slavery in the abstract" is a moral wrong. Now it is a universally conceded proposition that no institution is so perfect in practice as it is in theory. Slavery, then, being in theory wrong, must be we know not what, in practice. The horns of a dilemma, we fear, are not so comfortable a refuge as those of the altar, to which theologians commonly fly when pursued by the justice of Anti-Slavery.

But our good Doctor complains (in a note), that, at any rate, Abolitionists are unapostolic in endeavouring to render the slaveholders *odious*. Whether we be so or not, our labour is, at least, entirely superfluous, for their very name saves us the trouble in advance. That the apostles never denounced Slavery, is an argument like that by which Fielding's Newgate Chaplain defended his fondness for punch, which liquor, he said, pleased him, "the more especially as it was nowhere spoken ill of in Scripture." If the Doctor can imagine Saint Peter attending an auction-sale to purchase a "servant" who might look after his lines and nets, while he himself was evangelizing, we believe that he

"Could hold a fire in his hand,
By thinking of the frosty Caucasus."

Such questions as that of Slavery are not to be argued upon the narrow ground of isolated instances of cruelty and ferocity. It is condemned by a wider and easier process of induction. It dares not enter the court of conscience the world over. Even King Obi and King Boy acknowledge the wickedness of Slavery in the abstract. But the mass of men have not time for a process of reasoning based on purely ethical premises. In endeavouring to convince them that certain institutions produce certain fruit, it is easier to do it by plucking a specimen from the tree before their very eyes, than by any kind of analysis or synth

it may make of "dough-faces" among its political opponents is an indication not so much of a detestation of the creatures themselves, as of envy at the chance of being such to good profit.

### A Standing Offer for the Vice-Presidency.

That Abbot Lawrence, of Boston, was a candidate before the Philadelphia Convention for the Vice Presidency is known to everybody. Why the nomination was not given to him has never been made quite clear, as his pro-slavery character is unimpeachable, and he would therefore have been most heartily welcome to the South.—Probably Fillmore was preferred as certain to secure New York, a larger and more influential State than Massachusetts, while in every other respect he is as unobjectionable as Mr. Lawrence. Rumour however assigns another reason, which we have no doubt has also some truth in it.

A bargain, it is said, was completed, when the Congressional Committee went on to Massachusetts with the remains of John Quincy Adams, to the effect that Massachusetts should go for Taylor, and the Vice Presidency be given in exchange to Abbot Lawrence. There was "boot" however to this *swap* of the votes of a State for an office, to the amount of *one hundred thousand dollars*, promised by the proposed recipient of official honours. But somehow—so goes the story—an outrageous blunder was made in the packing of the Massachusetts delegation to the Philadelphia Convention, so that a number of impracticable persons got upon it who could neither be wheedled nor bullied into transferring their votes from Webster to Taylor. They were politically green enough to believe that the attempt on the part of the Whig leaders in Massachusetts to give the nomination to Webster was an honest one; and they in good faith stuck to their candidate without paying the least regard to the bargain of Mr. Lawrence to exchange their votes, with a bonus, for the Vice-Presidency. How many of the delegates understood the game that was to be played we know not, but great credit is due them for the adroitness with which they managed the weaker brethren of the Delegation.

The reader will believe as much of this story as he pleases. If a young man, or not familiar with the manœuvres of politicians, it may shock his preconceived notions on the purity of elections, and the blessings of our free and democratic Republic; he may nevertheless be assured that there is nothing in the story at all improbable, and although he may in the first flush of his indignation hurl a few hard names at Abbot Lawrence, he may see that if that gentleman did not absolutely make such a bargain in relation to this election, he is entirely capable of it, and has actually attempted something of the kind before.

The following instructive narrative we find in the *New York Day-Book*. Dr. Bacon, the editor is as well known for his honesty as his fearlessness, and nobody, we presume, will venture to contradict his statement.

On the evening of Thursday, the 25th of April, 1844, the writer of this was talking on the subject of the nomination for the Vice-Presidency, (which was to be made by the Whig National Convention at Baltimore on the following Wednesday,) with about half a dozen gentlemen with whom he happened to be taking tea. Three distinguished Southern Senators in Congress, two Southern Representatives in Congress, and a distinguished Northern Senator in Congress, were of the party. The writer was urging, with all his little might, the nomination of Millard Fillmore for the Vice-Presidency, and was showing how his character and sectional position would give more strength to "the Clay ticket" than that of John Davis or John Sergeant,—Mr. Frelinghuysen not being then talked of for the office. In reply to this, a gentlemen present urged the nomination of Abbot Lawrence for the Vice-Presidency, and declared that *money* was wanted to elect Mr. Clay, and that *Mr. Lawrence would certainly give the sum of* ($100,000) *one hundred thousand dollars to the Whig party to promote the success of the ticket* if the Convention would nominate him for the Vice-Presidency. The Northern Senator vehemently urged the nomination of Mr. Lawrence, in view of this important and weighty consideration.

The writer opposed and ridiculed the pretensions of Mr. Lawrence, and expressed contempt and abhorrence of the proposal to offer the Vice-Presidency for sale. He assured the Senator that it was useless to name Mr. Lawrence for the office at that late day, and warned his advocates that he would not receive one vote in the Convention. He said also—"If Abbot Lawrence is a sincere and patriotic Whig, and is so much interested in the maintenance of the Tariff or 1842, and if he has $100,000 to spare for political purposes, surely he will give it if Mr. Fillmore (the author of that Tariff) be nominated. And if Mr. Clay cannot be elected except with the help of money obtained by the sale of an office, let him be *defeated*!"

The result of the Convention was as predicted in regard to Mr. Lawrence. He did not receive a vote; nor was his name mentioned in the writer's hearing during a week's laborious canvass in Baltimore, preceding the unfortunate nomination of Mr. Frelinghuysen by the incorrigible blockheads principally composing the Convention, under the management of Reverdy Johnson and a conclave gathered in his parlor.

The Lawrence business of course passed away from the mind of the writer for a time. Between May and November he saw that 'that hundred thousand dollars' would be wanted badly, to save Mr. Clay from the evil consequences of the blunders of the Whig managers; but he never saw the day when he wished it had been raised by the sale of the Vice-Presidency. A quarter of the sum lawfully employed in August 1844, would have carried the State of New-York. But the money could not be had; and the Whigs succeeded in giving the State to Mr. Polk.

Until last night, the writer never heard anything more about Abbot Lawrence's offer of $100,000 for the Vice Presidency. It appears now that it was asserted by a Delegate from the West to the National Convention in Philadelphia, last June, that Abbot Lawrence had offered this particular sum for the same nomination on the Taylor ticket, and that his money had been freely used in and about that Convention to defeat the nomination of Henry Clay. This assertion was made in a caucus of the friends of Mr. Clay, held in Mayor Swift's office, the evening before the nomination. It has been made known to the public by Mr. Botts in his Vauxhall speech. It has been called in question by the New-York Express.

It may be untrue. But there is something startling in the appearance of this thing both in 1844 and 1848, from two totally different sources—without collusion. As was remarked last night, it seems to be "a standing offer" of $100,000 for the Vice-Presidency.

Mr. Lawrence seems to have some very imprudent friends, who take great liberties with his name and purse, if they were never authorized to make these "bids."

At any rate, let the truth be told,—"in season and out of season." It is not likely that the Whig papers will decide it to be expedient to discuss this delicate matter at this critical time. "Be just, and fear not"—is not a modern politician's maxim.

### Discretion of the Whig Candidates.

Gen. Cass was prevented by the "noise and confusion," attending a public reception of him somewhere at the West, from answering certain impertinent questions put to him by some jackass who had not the wit to hold his tongue at the proper place. The Whigs have cackled over the joke as if it were the only one of the season; but their own candidates are not a whit less discreet than Gen. Cass, though they take a different way of showing it, and choose a subject of far more importance than internal improvements on which to exercise their discretion. The course which each pursues, though diametrically opposite to that of the other, is marked by the same wisdom and prudence, for while one is discreetly silent the other is discreetly talkative, each acting according to his latitude. The object of both is to please—not the sovereign people, but—the sovereign South. With her Taylor's character needs no vouchers, as "good wine needs no bush." And as to what the North may think of him,—that is altogether a secondary matter; she always does as she is bid. Therefore "Old Zack" wisely holds his tongue on the subject of Slavery. The South knows and trusts him; he has friends enough at the North who very gladly do any amount of lying for him under the strange delusion that they have in their party men who have some conscientious scruples in regard to the extension of Slavery,—as if a man *could* support Taylor who cared a brass farthing whether the infernal system was extended to all creation, and for all eternity!

With Fillmore the case is very different. A Northern man is, *ipso facto*, always to be suspected at the South, and must therefore prove his loyalty to the sovereignty. The assertions of his friends will avail him nothing; he must prostrate himself at the footstool before the throne, and avow his devotion. We published last week a letter of Mr. Fillmore's, written for the South to the editor of the Express, wherein he avows himself in favour of the doctrine of non-interference with the trade in slaves between the States. We give now from the *Buena Vista*, published at Jackson, Miss. the following letter in which he is happy to declare that "Southern Institutions" will never be assailed or molested" by any act of his. The letter is as follows:

ALBANY, N. Y. August 16, 1848.

DEAR SIR—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 9th instant, enclosing a printed copy of the resolutions adopted by the Rough-and-Ready Club of Raymond on the fifth instant; and wishing to know whether the political sentiments contained in those resolutions are in accordance with my views.

The tenth and eleventh, only, speak of my views; and though I cannot feel justified in appropriating to myself all the flattering compliments contained in those resolutions, *yet I am happy to say that they truly define my position and express my views on the subject to which they allude.*

Please to make my acknowledgments to the members of your Club, and believe me, respectfully yours,

MILLARD FILLMORE.

JOHN B. PEYTON, Esq. *President.*

Such is the courteous tone in which the Whig candidate for the Vice Presidency responds to Resolutions which pledge him as clearly as words can to oppose, if he has the power, all attempts to exclude Slavery from new Territory; and such, no doubt, was the meaning of those who passed them. They are as follows:

10. Resolved, That we recognize in Millard Fillmore, the Whig candidate for the Vice Presidency, a genuine republican, a pure patriot, a man of exalted intellect and high acquirements—one who has served the Republic long and faithfully in the civil department of Government, whose every act manifests that he is a true devotee of liberty, whose name is prominently identified with the Whig party, and whose talents and patriotism justly entitle him to the love and admiration of his countrymen.

11. Resolved, That the charge of abolitionism, recklessly adduced against Millard Fillmore, by unscrupulous partisan opponents for the purpose of exciting sectional prejudices against him, has no foundation whatever in truth; but, on the contrary, is triumphantly disproved by the solemn declaration of our candidate for the Vice Presidency, uttered long since in the councils of the nation, that Congress has no power, under the Constitution, to interfere with the institution of domestic Slavery as it exists in the States of this Union; and that therefore we feel *well assured that Southern institutions will never be assailed or molested by any act of Millard Fillmore.*

Now in connection, and in contrast with this unequivocal pledges, so promptly given by Mr. Fillmore in these two letters, that he is all that the South asks of him, read the following letter to a gentleman in Boston who respectfully asked of the Whig candidate what were his opinions as to excluding foreigners from voting for 21 years, and of imposing upon all immigrants a capitation tex of $250 each. Wrong as we believe the aim of the Native American party, we think them at least as much entitled to respectful answers as Southern slave-breeders and flesh-mongers:

ALBANY, June 17th, 1848.

JOHN H. GOWAN, Esq.:—

SIR—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, in which you desire my views on certain points expressed in your letter. These inquiries are doubtless addressed to me in consequence of my recent nomination for the Vice Presidency; but while I never have, and trust I never shall shrink from any official responsibility which may be cast upon me, I am admonished by the experience of others that, as a candidate of the party that has put me in nomination, *I am not at liberty now* to make up and *publish* my political faith. A Whig Convention, without solicitation on my part, has generously taken me upon trust; and if there be any other sect or party that have sufficient confidence in my patriotism and integrity to give me their support on the same conditions, I shall be grateful for the favour; but I must say to all, that my past conduct is the only pledge that I can give for my future course. I must be at liberty when called upon to act, to do what I think is right.

Trusting that if you do not concur with me in opinion as to the propriety of the course which I have adopted, you will, at least, believe me when I say that no disrespect is intended to you, or those for whom you speak, in declining to express my opinion on the subject to which you refer,

I remain truly yours,

MILLARD FILLMORE.

### Free Soil in Missouri,

A Free Soil meeting was held in St. Louis, Missouri, a few days since, which passed off without any disturbance, and, from the account given of it in the *Herald*, seems to have elicited a good deal of enthusiasm. The leading spirit in it was Francis P. Blair, Jr., a son, we believe, of F. P. Blair of Washington, the well-known late editor of the *Globe*. The Resolutions are spirited and bold for the region in which they are published. They are as follows:—

Whereas, The National Convention, held at Baltimore in May last, by stifling the voice of the New York Democracy, and virtually excluding their delegates from a share in the proceedings of that Convention, committed a gross outrage upon the radical Democracy of that State, and through them, upon the Democracy of the whole nation; and, whereas the Convention, without the shadow of authority, invested one man from South Carolina with power to cast the nine votes of a State which had refused to be represented in the Convention; and whereas, the conservative majority in that body, by this double fraud and injustice, by thus destroying the representation of New York, and creating a fictitious representation from South Carolina, and by the shameless use of the executive patronage and official bribery, were enabled to present, as a democratic candidate, a man who bartered away his honest convictions for Southern votes—who has pledged himself to sustain the ultra Slavery doctrines of Mr. Calhoun and his adherents—who is notoriously a time-serving, intriguing, truckling politician, and who is unsound on the vital question of internal improvements; therefore, in view of these facts, it is

Resolved, That the proceedings of the Baltimore Convention, being marked with deliberate fraud, outrage and injustice, possesses no power to bind the Democracy of the nation, and that neither the military or political character of Lewis Cass is such as to commend him to the favour or confidence of Democrats.

Resolved, That the proviso of Jefferson, to prohibit the existence of Slavery after 1800, in all the territories of the United States, Southern and Northern, the votes of six States and sixteen delegates in the Congress of 1784, for the proviso, to three States and seven delegates against it; the actual exclusion of Slavery from the north-western territory, by the ordinance of 1787, unanimously adopted by the States in Congress, and the entire history of that period, clearly shows that it was the settled policy of the nation not to extend, nationalize or encourage, but to limit, localize and discourage Slavery; and to this policy, which should never have been departed from, the Government ought to return.

Resolved, That by the provisions of the Federal Constitution, Congress has power to prohibit the establishment of Slavery in territories where that institution does not exist; and believing both from reason and the experience of our country, that those States and communities flourish most where slave labour is prohibited, and free labour respected and encouraged, we are decidedly in favour of the exclusion of Slavery from the territories of New Mexico and California, by an act of Congress.

Resolved, That in advocating such legislation to prevent the extension of Slavery over New Mexico and California, we are governed solely by a desire to promote the welfare of the future population of those territories, for whose benefit exclusively, Congress should legislate, and not for the benefit of South Carolina, Massachusetts, or any one of the States. While unwilling that our free republic should, in the face of the civilized world, assume the attitude of extending and propagating the system of Slavery, we disclaim any respect for, or sympathy with, that spirit of abolition fanaticism which would trample on the rights of the holders of slaves, and which would interfere with the institution as it exists in States, sanctioned and protected by law.

Resolved, That we re-affirm our adherence to the great measures which have distinguished the republican party of this country, among which are the independant treasury, a free trade tariff, and our opposition to shinplaster conservatism, to every species of class legislation, and to the whole brood of Federal measures—that we are also in favour of river and harbour improvements, within constitutional limits, and the reduction of the price of public lands, so as to afford them to actual settles at the cost of survey.

Resolved, That we heartily approve the course of policy pursued by the administrations of the illustrious Jackson, and his successor and bosom friend, Martin Van Buren; and believe that much of our present prosperity and happiness is due to the wise and able administrations of those radical Democrats and distinguished statesmen.

Resolved, That we pledge our enthusiasm and unwavering support to that spotless patriot and unrivalled statesman Martin Van Buren, the sage of Lindenwald, and long the favourite champion of the radical democracy;—that his transcendent abilities, his stainless integrity, his eminent public services and unflinching devotion to the cause of freedom and Jeffersonian Democracy, throughout a long life dedicated to his country, have endeared him to every Democrat, and won the respect even of his enemies. By his side, and under the guidance of Charles F. Adams we are willing to stand or fall on the platform of *free soil, free trade, free labour and free speech.*

Resolved, That we applaud the manliness of the Honourable William H. Haywood, of North Carolina, in repudiating the conservative Lewis Cass, and giving his powerful support to Van Buren and Adams.

Resolved, That we invite the Hon. John Van Buren to visit St. Louis, prior to the election, to address us upon the issues of the present canvass, and pledge him a most cordial reception and an attentive audience.

---

WILLIS HALL, the leader of the late Clay party in this city, with a devotion worthy of a better cause, was true to his old leader to the last moment, and only abandoned him at his own request. In a letter published since the final meeting of the party he says:

No one but Mr. Clay himself could have arrested the movement. It was supposed that he would decline accepting the nomination—for that we were prepared and fully intended to proceed upon our own responsibility, but we were not prepared for an appeal to us, as his personal friends, not to use his name. Venerating the man above all living men—accustomed to obey his slightest wishes—the appeal was unanswerable. However painfully mortifying, his friends, myself among the number, were constrained to abandon our purpose, and that noble old standard which had been thrown to the breeze, was furled for the last time.

Mr. Hall states very clearly the reasons for the course which he has now determined to pursue. We make an extract from his letter. Greeley and his fellow dough-faces, who have been whipped into the traces by the bully of the *Courier and Enquirer*, and the booby of the *Express*, would blush, if they had manliness, enough to see how readily a straightforward, honest man answers their "choose-the-least-of-two-devil's" doctrine.

But I am told I can best prevent the extension of Slavery by voting for Gen. Taylor. Why? is he opposed to it? No; but he will not veto it. Perhaps so. But he distinctly refuses to say whether he will or not. Past all question he is opposed to *Free Soil*, and will use all his power and patronage against it. His neighbours in the South, who see him in his undress, say that they know he is with them on this question. His friends at the North practically admit it by bounding their hopes by the empty fact that he will not veto it. He has recently invested $100,000 in slaves; he has accepted the Charleston nomination, made for the avowed purpose of opposing it. The South made the Presidential nomination to turn upon this question, and he was selected. The great Ratification Meeting held by his friends in Canal-street passed a resolution expressly repudiating his doctrine.

Mr. Webster says if he thought Gen. Taylor opposed to *Free Soil* he would vote against him. On a candid examination of all the evidence, I am compelled to the belief that he is opposed to the doctrine of *Free Soil*, and will do all in his power to defeat it. On Mr. Webster's authority, those who come to the same conclusion must vote against Gen. Taylor.

On this point, the opinions of all the other candidates, Mr. Clay, Gen. Scott, Judge McLean, were frankly and explicitly avowed. Why was Gen. Taylor excused?—The North or the South is to be cheated. Which is most likely to be the victim? Friends of *Free Soil* pause! You are about to be betrayed. When it is too late you will find that you have elected the only man who could have defeated your favourite object. Hereafter you cannot justify yourselves to your consciences or your God without requiring a more explicit declaration on this point from Gen. Taylor.

But, expostulates my friend, 'You cannot vote for Mr. Van Buren.' Why not, if he will best effect the object which I have most at heart. I am not a Brabantio, to "refuse to serve God because the Devil bids me."—Were my prejudices a hundred times stronger than they are against Mr. Van Buren, I should vote for him, if convinced he would truly carry out the principle he now professes. I have no reason to doubt it. His worst enemy cannot say he has not always been true to his pledges. I have been educated in the maxim "Principles—not men."

For this reason I cannot vote for Gen. Taylor, for whom, as a military man, in which capacity alone I have known him, I entertain high admiration—for this reason I *can* vote for Mr. Van Buren, whom I have always opposed and against whom I have many prejudices.

As the representative of Free Trade, a military organization, &c.. I oppose him, and would do so again; as the representative of *Free Soil* I will sustain him. In our system the principle is everything, the man nothing. The friends of *Free Soil* have selected him in spite of himself as the best man, under the circumstances, to effect their great object. Shall I abandon the principle which I have long cherished because I might have preferred some other man to represent it? This would be indeed to prefer men to principles.

I am again told that it is useless that Mr. Van Buren cannot be elected—perhaps so. If I had selected my candidate for Availability, I might have preferred some other. But voting for Mr. Van Buren is not therefore useless. It is material to the ultimate success of the principle of *Free Soil*, that its friends should make the strongest possible demonstration at this time. If it is feeble and limited it will be despised by the South, and ridiculed alike by the friends of Cass and Taylor. If, on the other hand, it now shows an imposing front—if its lion roar is heard through the forest, the South will not dare to demand that the new territories be admitted without restriction, and if it does, neither the Cass nor the Taylor party will dare to accede to their demand. Every vote strengthens the cause of *Free Soil*, whether Van Buren is elected or not. Nine-tenths of the voters of the North are opposed to the farther extension of Slavery, let but half that number speak out like men, and their voice will be as potential as the creative fiat; but if deterred by the cajolery of partisans, the senseless love of success, a base hungering for spoils, or by any other motive, let them hereafter lie down under the gibes and domination of Slavedom, nor dare again to express a manly sentiment, which from fear or folly, they are unable to carry into action.

---

THE SPEECH OF SENATOR DIX.—We occupy a large portion of this week's paper with the Speech of Mr. Dix, on the question of the extension of Slavery. Notwithstanding its length, our readers, in this State at least, will not fail to give it a careful perusal, as Mr. Dix is the candidate of the Free Soilers for Governor. Were we a voter we should be in no haste to give our suffrage to a man who esteems an apology necessary to the South for the act of a former Governor of New York in refusing to deliver up, on the requisition of the Governor of Virginia, certain men charged with no greater crime than "opening the prison doors to those that are in bonds." It is by no means improbable that just such a requisition would be made upon Mr. Dix should he be chosen the Governor of the State, and were we a Free Soil, or Liberty party man, we should not reflect with much satisfaction upon our share in placing him in a position where he would hold it to be an act of official duty to deliver up to imprisonment for life, a man who should commit an act so simply humane as to aid a slave in escaping from bondage. On the question of the extension of Slavery he seems trust-worthy, and we hope he will be kept in the Senate.

---

"CAVED IN."—The *last* meeting of the Clay party was held in this city a few evenings since, and went off, if not in a blaze of glory, at least with tremendous excitement. To the leaders was left no alternative but to withdraw the name of Mr. Clay, who had not only publicly declined being considered a candidate, but had made a personal appeal to his friends at the head of the movement in this city to relieve him from such a position. The announcement of this necessity to the meeting was received with various feelings, some, like John M. Botts, who made a speech on the occasion, and Horace Greely availing themselves of the opportunity to go over to Taylor, while others who cannot support the candidate selected by the Whig party as the best representative of the only principle that distinguishes that party—the extension of Slavery—reluctantly give up their old favourite, and have gone over to Van Buren, or determined not to vote at all. We doubt if many of them followed the lead of the editor of the *Tribune*. He might have led them forward, but not on the back track. He himself has become a follower at the tail end of a party which he has affected to despise, and which certainly ought, and no doubt does despise him most heartily.

---

### To Correspondents.

S. M. Jr. We very rarely have such opportunity, but D. doubtless could send here if he were written to.

L. P. We are much obliged to him for the interesting facts he communicates, which we lay up for use at the proper time.

J. N. of L. A year's papers are still due him. Shall they be sent?

S. B. Will he send us the duplicate account asked for? We publish the following letter for his special information, as he sent us the name of the person referred to in it, and will thank him to send us the correct address,—if we have really had the wrong one.

CHARLESTOWN, Jefferson co. Va. Aug. 26th, 1848.

DEAR SIR:—The "National Anti-Slavery Standard," addressed to Rebecca Davidson, has been coming to this office for several numbers back. I know of no such person in this county, and if she did reside here, the laws expressly forbid the circulation of such incendiary papers as yours, and therefore she would not get them, as I shall certainly fulfil the law.

Please stop them.

Very respectfully,

E. M. AISQUITH, P. M.

## Foreign Intelligence.

SEVEN DAYS LATER

## FROM EUROPE.

### ARRIVAL OF THE AMERICA.

The steamer AMERICA arrived at this port on Friday the 29th ult. She sailed from Liverpool on the 16th.

The most important news by her is that of an outbreak in Ireland. Much alarm was caused by the first rumors in England, but the later accounts represent it to be of little consequence.

The following are the accounts published in the first and second editions of the *Liverpool Journal*.

### Alarming News from Ireland.

We received late last evening the following from the office of the Electric Telegraph Company. Our readers must judge for themselves as to giving full credit to the statement. The Dublin papers of yesterday via Holyhead, in the usual way, reached us yesterday evening, and they distinctly stated that the trains, arriving at 4 o'clock yesterday morning in Dublin, from the south, had no confirmation of the alarming rumours of Thursday. We suppose that the Electric Telegraph Company have obtained their information by an arrival at Bristol. The correspondence subjoined is, we presume, from late editions of yesterday's Dublin papers.

CLONMEL, September 14.

The out-offices of a Protestant clergyman was burnt down last night, and a farmer shot for refusing to give up arms.

The 3d Buffs came into Clonmel to-day, and had 39 of their men handcuffed for having shouted for repeal.

The insurgent camp is now seven miles from Clonmel, and I am informed that they roast the bullocks and sheep on iron gates. They are pressing every one to join them.

A real rebellion has broken out at last. The rebels are posted in almost inaccessible positions on Newtown and Kilmacthomas hills. Doheney commands in the county of Waterford.

The troops yesterday only captured nine scouts. Last night there was a general rising of the peasantry, within about six miles of Carrick. Many had guns.

At six o'clock a large body marched to attack the police station at Glenbower, about eight miles from Clonmel. The police were preparing to take refuge in Carrick, when the rebels fired on them. The police returned the fire, and the fight lasted a quarter of an hour. The result was that a number of the insurgents were killed, and only three of the police wounded. The rebels fled, and the dead bodies were left behind.

The police have fled from all the outer stations, and tonight, it is feared, will reveal some awful scenes.

The Cork paper, while giving the rumor of Doheny being at the head of the insurgents, mentions it as the general belief in Cork, that that individual, with other leading insurgents, were among those lost in the Ocean Monarch.

[We have taken every precaution to prove the authenticity of the above communication; but in reply to our messages of inquiry forwarded to London, we are only informed that the news went by Crewe to the metropolis, and was thence telegraphed to Liverpool.]

### The Latest from Ireland.

By the mail boat, which left Kingston last night, we have received the Dublin evening papers of yesterday. They bring no confirmation of the alarming news which we gave with a caution to our readers, under the head Latest News. The *Dublin Evening Mail*, admits that there is a disturbance in the neighbourhood of Carrahmore; but speaks of it as dying away. The whole account, as it now stands, is merely to the extent that three police barracks have been attacked at Rathgormack, Portlaw, and the Slate Quarries; that in these cases some one or two of the people may have been killed, that a bridge has been dismantled at Gurney; that there has been a collision with a small body of military and the mob, the latter being discomfitted and driven for refuge into the woods of Carraghmore; that bonfires, up to Wednesday night, have been seen blazing on the hills of Waterford and Kilkenny, and that there is some sort of a camp rebelliously occupied, formed on Aheny Hill—this camp being defended by a few pieces of cannon plundered from the house of the Marquis of Waterford. At the Portlaw barrack the mob force did not exceed four hundred. Several prisoners have been taken by a detached corps of the 86th regiment of infantry, and these men have been identified as criminated in the attack on the police barracks, Mr. O'Mahoney is said to have headed a guerilla expedition on Wednesday, the object of which was a predatory excursion in the neighbourhood of Kilmacthomas, in search of arms. Nothing more is said of Mr Doheny. The military and the police are everywhere on the alert, and so far there is no doubt of their having been completely successful in such small encounters as they may have yet had with the would-be insurgents. A report of what was going on had been forwarded to Rear-Admiral Mackey.

The *Pilot*, Dublin paper, of last evening, while not denying these facts, refuses to look upon them as at all significant or alarming.

The *Dublin Freemens' Journal* of this morning, says:—

"No small amount of excitement prevailed in town during the entire of yesterday, in consequence of the alarming, though vague, and in many respects inconsistent, reports that had reached town by the morning mail, with regard to an insurrectionary movement in the south of Ireland.

The only local journals that reached town yesterday, containing any information on the subject of the alleged "rising," were the *Clonmel Chronicle* and *Kilkenny Moderator*, both conservative, and, without meaning in the slightest degree to impeach the veracity of either, both well disposed to impart an alarming tint to any intelligence they originate in reference to the peasantry.

"The only facts that may be looked upon as certain are, that some movement of the peasantry in the vicinage of Carrick has taken place, and that two or three persons, found with arms on their persons, have been arrested. The extent of the movement, its objects, and its leaders, are as yet very imperfectly known, and every man, according to his temper and his views, puts his own interpretation on each fact as it transpires."

The Correspondent of the (Dublin) Freeman's Journal writes under date of:

KILKENNY, Thursday Evening, Sept. 14.

The districts of this and the adjoining county of Tipperary which were disturbed during the beginning of the week, now wear an aspect of the utmost calm, and the people seem to be engaged in the fields at their usual avocations, as if nothing uncommon had recently occurred in the neighbourhood. Rumor is of course still busy, and we have flying reports of occasional fires on the hills around Dungarvan, in the County of Waterford, last night, and of a meeting this morning of a large concourse of peasantry, at a place called Bawndonnell, a portion of the Slievenamon range, but situate immediately on the opposite side of the mountain from Aheny. To these reports, however, I give but little credence, and I have no "revolutionary" intelligence to impart to you which could be considered based upon any authority.

Major General McDonald is in this city, with his Aid de camp, Lieut. McDonald, and his military Secretary, Lieut. Colonel Wood. Capt. Roberts. Assistant Inspector-General of Constabulary, has also arrived here to take command of the Police force of the District. The battalion of the 60th Rifles, which arrived from Dublin by the late train of yesterday evening, are still encamped in the barrack square here.

It is asserted here that a farmer, residing in the neighbourhood of Bawndonnell, and obnoxious to the peasantry, was this morning shot by some of the people. This is stated on authority to which, under ordinary circumstances, credence would be fully due. But at present I would be reluctant to vouch for the accuracy of any report not officially authenticated.

The driver of the Clonmel car, who arrived here at eight o'clock this evening, states that the most perfect tranquility prevailed along the entire of his route through Tipperary.

Of the causes of this outbreak the same paper thus speaks:

They are not political, but social. They arise from the relations between landlord and tenant. We have been assured that scarcely a load of agricultural produce is sent to market, without a person empowered by the landlord, his agent, the bailiff, *or his agent, accompanying it to market, and receiving from the buyer the price of the commodity*, giving to the grower anything or nothing—just as he pleased! This has maddened the people, and it is more than feared it will cause a general rising all over, at least the South of Ireland. It is said that a seizure of crops was the immediate cause of the outbreak.

The correspondent of the *London Daily News* writes as follows: all who were on the spot and had facilities for ascertaining the facts, agree in stating that the movement was altogether of an agrarian character, and had no political object whatever. The impelling motives were poverty and privation, not the hope of political amelioration.

Lord John Russell as he was about to step into his carriage in Dublin, at the termination of his visit to Ireland was summoned as a witness on the trial of Smith O'Brien.

The French papers are chiefly busy with the approaching election. The principal attention is directed towards Napoleon Bonaparte.

The commission appointed to regulate the indemnity to be paid to the French colonists, in consequence of the abolition of Slavery, meet every day. It appears that three plans have been proposed: the first denies the right of the colonists to an indemnity, but accords it to their necessities; the second recognizes the right of the colonists to a full indemnity, according to the value of the slaves emancipated; the third plan fixes the indemnity at 120,000f. (£4,800,000), to be divided among the colonists. Several delegates from the colonies have been examined by the commission.

Insurrections have taken place at Leghorn and Genoa. In Genoa the disturbance was in consequence of the expulsion of a radical writer, De Boni. He was recalled the next day and order restored. From Leghorn the accounts are of more serious difficulties. The immediate cause was the interdiction of the meetings of the clubs. Placards to this effect were torn down by the people, and collision ensued between them and their troops, which ended in the death of many on both sides, and finally the fraternization of the soldiers with the people. A Provisional Government had been appointed until the Grand Duke thinks proper to send down the Prince Corsini to resume his usual autho.

Messina has been attacked by a party of Neapolitans, and a considerable part of the city was destroyed. The latest statement is that the city was taken by the Neapolitans, but there is some confusion in the accounts.

Affairs in Germany are in a very perturbed condition—The Parliament at Frankfort have virtually rejected the armistice between Prussia and Denmark, relating to the Schleswig—Holstein difficulty, and the ministry had resigned. The ministers at Berlin and Vienna have also resigned. At Cologne on the evening of the 8th about 2,000 persons assembled in the hall of the Democratic Union, and repeated, line by line, the poem entitled "The Dead to the Living," for writing which Freiligrath is now imprisoned.—Those portions which alluded to the Republic, to the destruction of thrones, &c., were greeted with immense applause. Late in the evening one of the editors of the *New Rheinische Zeitung* entered the hall, and announced the defeat of the Ministers. The intelligence was received with deafening cheers, which were repeated all along the main streets after the Assembly had left the hall. The Liberals of Cologne have forwarded an address to the National Assembly in Frankfort against the truce with Denmark, and another to the Constituent Assembly in Berlin, denouncing that clause in the *Burgerwehr* Bill which obliges every member of that body to swear allegiance to the King.

### Married.

At the North American Phalanx, Monmouth Co. N. J. on Tuesday evening September 26. by Rev. John French, JAMES WARREN to EMMA LAWSON all of the above place.

In Warren, R. I. on the 21 ult, by the Rev. G. W. Hathaway, SAMUEL VAN RENSSELAER HICKCOX, Esq. of the Worcester *Ægis*, to Miss SUSAN, caughter of Hon. Nathan M. Wheaton, of Warren.

At Walnut Grove, near Geneva, N. Y. Sept. 6, SAMUEL BOWLES Jr. of the Republican, Springfield, Mass. to Miss MARY S. DWIGHT.

In Springfield, Mass. September 28, Rev. WILLIAM G. WHITE, of Salem, to MARGARETTA E. daughter of Chester Harding, of S.

In Troy, on the 27th ultimo by the Rev. John Pierpont, Miss CAROLINE AUGUSTA, daughter of the officiating clergyman, to JOSEPH M. BOARDMAN, Esq. of Macon, Ga.

### Died.

At Brooklyn, on the 27th ult., Hon. MICHAEL HOFFMAN, aged 60 years, Naval Officer of the Port of New York.

On the 9th ult., in Philadelphia, MARY ANN ELLIOTT, wife of William B. Elliott.

At her residence in Penn's Grove, Chester County, Pa. on the 16th of 9th month, ELIZABETH KENT, after a painful and protracted illness.

In Philadelphia, on the 1st inst., Commodore JOHN BIDDLE, U. S. N. in his 66th year.

### This Week's Paper.

FOURTH PAGE.—*Poetry*: The Inner Life; The Devil and the Potatoes; Plaint. *Miscellany*: The present Pope; The Holy Land—Jacob's Well and the Samaritans; Literary Relics; Dyer and Charles Lamb. Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

FIRST PAGE.—*Selections*: Speech of Hon. John A. Dix.

SECOND PAGE.—*Selections*: Conclusion of Hon. John A Dix's Speech; &c., &c.

## Notices.

### THE PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR OF 1848.

Demands of all the friends of the slave in this region, prompt and vigorous efforts in its preparation. We know some of them, both in town and country, have long been busily at work in its behalf. So well is it understood and felt, that the Fair belongs to Pennsylvania Abolitionists generally, that our Annual summons to the work seems scarcely needed, and almost a form. But we issue it as a word of remembrance to the interested, and to arouse the lethargic—and to announce—at this important crisis—to an increasingly sympathizing community, an opportunity to labour for the cause. We invite the co-operation of every heart that loves the slave, and would prove its love by its deeds.

To our numerous fellow-labourers in city and country it cannot be unnecessary to speak on the subject of the best manner of preparing for the Fair. In such preparation they are well skilled. To those to whom the work may be new we say, all pretty or marketable commodities will be valuable.

To *all* we say, make the slave's cause your own, if possible, and give liberally as God hath given you.

| | |
|---|---|
| *Sarah Pugh,* | *Esther Reckless,* |
| *A. Matilda Cassey,* | *Maria M. Davis,* |
| *Anna M. Hopper,* | *Elizabeth Gay,* |
| *Janette Jackson,* | *Hannah W. Haydock,* |
| *Margaret A. Griscom,* | *Elizabeth Davis,* |
| *Mary Grew,* | *Emma Parker,* |
| *Margaret Jones,* | *Gertrude K. Burleigh,* |
| *Hannah L. Stickney,* | *Emily A. Winslow,* |
| *Mary T. Stickney,* | *Clementine G. Ruby,* |
| *Sarah A. T. McKim,* | *Martha Carman,* |
| *Theresa K. Hallowell,* | *Sarah T. Child,* |
| *Hulda Justice,* | *Anna M. Child,* |
| *Elizabeth Carman,* | *Mary Shaw,* |
| *Harriet D. Purvis,* | *Margaret Forten,* |
| *Priscilla Lukens,* | *Esther Hogeland,* |
| *Sarah M. Douglass,* | *Esther Burr,* |
| *Elizabeth Clendenen.* | |

FIFTEENTH

## National Anti-Slavery Bazaar.

The undersigned, earnestly desiring the abolition of Slavery have been led, by the strength of their wish, carefully to consider what means may be found sufficient for the accomplishment of this great and holy object. They find that Slavery exists through the selfishness, the ignorance, the cowardice, the hypocrisy of the people. If the nation could be made more conscientious, disinterested, courageous, enlightened, and true to its own political and religious principles, the work were done. Until enough nobility of spirit can be awakened in the land to make the clergyman, the farmer, the lawyer, the mechanic, the merchant and the politician, willing to renounce their hopes of worldly success, and see their respective careers of individual advancement closed up, apparently forever, by their allegiance to Freedom;—to make the women of the land feel themselves disgraced by their indifference to such a cause as this;—to make the Christians and citizens of the land willing to bear the suffering and odium consequent upon an adherence to the right against law and custom:—until this can be accomplished, the Southern slaveholders are upheld in their sin by the powerful support of Christian fellowship, social sanction, and civil participation.

We determine, therefore, to strike at once at the root of Slavery, by appealing to the hearts and consciences of men and withdrawing their allegiance from such shameful cruelty and wrong, by the continual presentation of the paramount claims of Freedom and Humanity. Union being strength that fact decides us to co-operate with any whose principles prove them to be trustworthy; who make the abolition of Slavery their primary object; and who, in addition to their honesty of purpose, have sense and sagacity enough to make them safe coadjutors, by securing them from becoming the prey of the selfish set of hypocritical adventurers that every moral revolution calls forth. We find such a sufficient and trustworthy body nowhere but in the American Anti Slavery Society. Years of close observation of its righteous principles and uncompromising practical workings, assure us that it has the elements of success. It continually sends forth lecturers to enforce the principles of justice and humanity among the people, and in a few years is found thereby to have exercised a controlling influence for good throughout the country. It dictates the course and bends the policy of every political party: and, speaking as it does from a height above their selfish personal struggles, its words of everlasting truth are heard, and more and more obeyed. While calling on all to unite with it, it has ever, by the energy and rectitude of its progress, been free without license, and effective without invidiousness. It is not too much to say in its praise, that its cause and its course repel all but the wise, the good, and the bold from active co-operation with it, and brand with dishonour the hand that approaches it to make it the instrument of any selfish purpose. It has no local attachments, no partizan or sectarian partialities, no hidden aim, no double purpose; while, at the same time, every observer notices how happily its labours prepare

# Poetry.

From the Christian Rationalist.

## THE INNER LIFE.

BY S. H. LLOYD.

The Outward World that round us lies
Is not the world in which we dwell,
The Inner World alone is real—
The world we neither buy nor sell.
I'm master of all outward things,
Within my soul I take my seat,
And Nature comes in perfumed robes
And lays her treasures at my feet.
All things I have within myself,
Suns set and suns within me rise,
I live within bright palace walls
Arched o'er by lovely jewelled skies,
I come and go, a wandering bee
That roams each flowery scented field,
And treasure up the golden fruit
My daily thoughts and pastimes yield.

I look at things not as they seem,
In all I see the Father's face;
All Nature is a part of Him,
The bending sky is his embrace.
His breath embalms the dewy flowers,
He makes the sun his triumph car.
His voice I hear in every breeze,
His smile I see in every star.
He builds his altar every where,
On every heart his dews distil,
His Heaven is with the pure in heart,
Its temple gates, the human will.

I turn away from beaten paths
Where trade and politics deceive,
And love to roam each wood and glen,
And feel my breast with rapture heave;
The world wants not that which I have,
But still I love the inner life,
And nought can tempt my heart away
To mingle with its scenes of strife;
For deep within I have a vein
More rich than gold that veins the earth,
And deep within are loving thoughts,
That give to joy and trust their birth;
That Inner World, O be it mine,
And mine to tread each sacred hall,
To enter in its silent courts
And know the perfect Soul of All.

## THE DEVIL AND THE POTATOES.

AN IRISH BALLAD.

AIR—"*The Devil came fiddlin' through the town.*"

I.

The Irish soil swarmed thick with toads
And reptiles holding revel,
But good St. Patrick drove them out,
And sore surprised the Devil.
"Ha! ha!" quoth he, "St. Patrick dear,
You think you're wondrous clever;
But I'll send you plagues far worse than these,
And bother you for ever."

II.

The ripe grain grew in Irish fields
As thus they held their parley—
Each plain and river-bank was fair
With corn, and rye, and barley;
St. Patrick thought no harm could come
To land thus favoured highly,
But the devil knew more tricks than he,
And took his measures slily.

III.

He taught the people to distil
The corn to burning liquor;
It fired their eyes—it baked their brains—
It made their blood run thicker,
"Ha! ha!" said he, "St. Patrick dear,
You've cleared the land of vermin;
But if my plague's not worse than yours,
I leave you to determine."

IV.

St. Patrick wept for very shame
To see that frantic nation;
They drank, they swore, they fought, they slew,
For fun or desperation;
Their vices ripened into crimes—
The Devil laughed at *that* trick,
And clapped his hands in furious joy,
And sniggered at St. Patrick.

V.

At last the Saint plucked up his heart,
And sought a man to aid him,
Found Father Mathew in his church,
And laboured to persuade him:—
"Go forth," said he, "o'er all the land—
We'll catch the Devil winking—
And teach the people, for my sake,
The wickedness of drinking."

VI.

The Father did as he was bid—
His mission prospered rarely,
And all the world confessed with joy
He beat the devil fairly.
But Satan laughed, and laughed outright—
"No doubt you're mighty clever,
But, faith, I know a better trick
To give you work for ever.

VII.

"I've failed," thought he, "in way of drink,
The game's not worth repeating—
The next shall be a surer move;
I'll curse them in their eating.
To make a nation bold and strong,
Industrious, nothing fearing,
The best of food is corn and beef—
I'll banish them from Erin.

VIII.

"For food to please the idle taste—
For lazy loons to feed on—
To keep existence warm enough
For slattern wives to breed on—
To fill the land with pithless swarms
At most prolific rate, oh—
I want no aid of beef or corn—
I'll do with the Potato."

IX.

He thought: he did: the evil spread.
The root found favour daily,
Where corn grew ripe, where mutton fed,
Its green stalks flourished gaily.
The peasant led a lazy life,
And each man with his neighbor
Went fighting feuds, and smoking pipes.
And hating sturdy labour.

X.

The Devil laughed, as well he might,
To know his plot succeeding,
And poor St. Patrick wept and groaned,
And struck his bosom bleeding.
Let's hope he'll find the means ere long
To teach all Macs and great O's,
To cheat the Devil once for all,
And do without Potatoes.

—[*London Puppet Show.*]

## PLAINT.

BY EBENEZER ELLIOT.

Dark, deep, and cold the current flows
Unto the sea, where no wind blows,
Seeking the land which no one knows.

O'er its sad gloom still comes and goes
The mingled wail of friends and foes,
Borne to the land which no one knows.

Why shrieks for help yon wretch, who goes
With millions from a world of woes
Unto the land which no one knows?

Though millions go with him who goes
Alone he goes where no wind blows,
Unto the land which no one knows.

For all must go where no wind blows,
And none can go for him who goes;
None, none return whence no one knows.

Why should the wretch who shrieking goes
With millions from a world of woes,
Reunion seek with it on those?

Alone with God, where no wind blows,
And death his shadow—doom'd he goes:
That God is there, the shadow shows!

Oh, shoreless deep, where no wind blows!
And thou, oh, land, which no one knows!
That God is All, the shadow shows.

# Miscellany.

From the Christian Inquirer.

## THE PRESENT POPE.

WRITTEN IN ITALY, BY MRS. C. M. KIRKLAND.

A somewhat grandiloquent Life of Pius IX., which we found at Naples, says "the whole universe has its eyes intently fixed on the radiance which eminates from the chair of St. Peter's;" and thinking there may be at least a grain of truth under this great mountain of rhodomontade, we take advantage of Monsieur Alphonse Ballevdier's book to prepare for the readers of the *Inquirer* a short sketch of the Life of Pio Nono, certainly the most conspicuous individual in Europe at the present time. The traveller in Italy hears of scarcely any other person, excepting always Gioberti, an ex-priest, whose word is quoted as prophecy throughout the Italian States. When Gioberti visits Pio Nono, all Italy waits to hear the result of the conference. There were suspicions of the Pope's fidelity to the Italian cause some little time ago; but Gioberti went to Rome, had many interviews with the pontiff, and assured the people that Pio Nono was all right, which satisfied everybody. Italy, therefore, is so happy as to own at one time two great men; and it is of one of them that we propose, at present, to offer some notice, reserving an account of the other for a future paper.

Giovanni Maria Mastai Ferretti was born at Sinigaglia, a small city in the Marca d'Ancona, on the 13th of May, 1792. His family had no claims to nobility, except, as his biographer observes, the nobility of the heart. He was noted for an amiable temper from his earliest years; and, as he grew up, became more and more studious, and gave further and more striking tokens of the seriousness and benevolence which have marked his character hitherto. His eighteenth year found him at Rome, where his good qualities attracted the attention of Pius VII., who held him in such regard that the doors of the Vatican were at all times open to him. It was at this period that Giovanni Mastai became the subject of those terrible epileptic attacks which threatened to blight his hopes of usefulness, especially in the profession of arms, which he had chosen. This blow almost prostrated his energies, and his depression attracted the attention of his friend, the pope. And here we must give verbatim the account furnished by our devout biographer, leaving our readers to believe as much or as little of the miraculous portion of it as they may choose, supposing, however, that they, like ourselves, will neither discredit all the facts, nor accept all the inferences of our friend, M. Balleydier.

"One morning, Mastai received the following billet, written with the Pope's own hand:

"'*My dear Mastai*—

"'Come to me, to-day at 2 o'clock. I have something to tell you from God. Pio VII.'"

"At two o'clock, Ferretti entered the chamber of the Pope, whom he found seated in an arm-chair, decorated with the pontifical emblems. He gave the young man a sign to approach, and offered him his hand to kiss.

"'My dear son," said he, 'have you never given any thought to the sanctity of the ecclesiastical life?'

"'Often, O holy father; especially since it has pleased God to visit me with this terrible malady; but the obstacle which will prevent my embracing the profession of arms, will equally shut me out from the service of the Church.'

"'It is true, my son; yet you are young,' and hope belongs to your time of life.'

"'There are diseases which distinguish hope. Mine can never be cured.'

"'Never is a word which belongs only to God——'

"'And to the physician, O holy father!'

"'The physicians are far from infallible. Their condemnation is often a presage of good.' (Satirical Pius VII!) 'Hope, therefore, my son.'

"'In the physicians?'

"'No; in God. His Son, who raised from the dead the man Lazarus, can cure, if he will, the boy Ferretti. And he will cure you, if I may trust to my secret presentiments, and if your faith is strong, and your soul in a fit state to receive the influences of his Spirit.'

"'I believe, wholly, in God the Father Almighty.'

"'It is well, my son; hope! unite your prayers with mine. Let us, for nine successive days, implore our Divine Master to afford you the relief which art is not able to render. At the end of these nine days, come to me again, and receive the bread of eternal life—and we shall see.'

"For nine days after this the unhappy young man went each morning to the Church of Santa Maria degli Angeli, with his feet bare, and his head exposed to the rays of the burning sun. There, prostrate before the altar, his tears streaming upon the pavement on which he knelt, he implored the mercy of Heaven. At the end of this period, he received the communion from the hands of the Pope.

"From that time, his person, which had become slightly curved, regained its erectness; his eye recovered its fire; the marked pallor of his countenance gave place to the freshness of youth; and up to the present time he has remained entirely free from the attacks of his terrible enemy. This wonderful cure seemed, as well to himself as to Pius VII., a manifestation of the will of God that he should consecrate himself to the priesthood. He entered the seminary at once, and throughout his course of study maintained the high character he had earned in his former position."

This being the only decided miracle recorded in the life of Pio Nono, we have thought best to give it entire. It is better worth believing than many that are recorded in the annals of his church, for it recognizes the efficiency of direct and simple prayer to God himself, in an hour of need. That the cure was effected we need not doubt, for the fact that Mastai was once affected with epilepsy, is as well known as that there is no healthier or finer looking man in Italy, of his years, than Pio Nono. Whether he himself believes in the miraculousness of his cure, we cannot say.

When he was ordained priest, he took the direction of an institution for the support and Christian education of orphans. This position, to the duties of which he devoted himself with characteristic energy, was to him an opportunity of growth in the religious life, in the care of the poor and the unfortunate.

After this, he went as a missionary to Chili, in South America, with Monsignore Muzi, now bishop of Castello, under whom he held the post of ecclesiastical counsellor. He received the affectionate benediction of the good Pius VII., at parting, with many charges as to the apostolical fulfilment of his mission; but serious differences soon arising between the papal nuncio and the governor of Chili, Muzi and his associates were forced to abandon that enterprise, and Mastai returned, leaving behind him in the Western world a fame corresponding to that which the excellence of his life had acquired for him at home. Our biographer tells an interesting story of his zeal and kindness to a dying man and his family, whom he found in a miserable dwelling in Chili, but the particulars are too numerous for our present limits;—briefly, the dying man was converted and baptized by means of the prayers and tears of the good priest, who unfolded to him the love of God in Jesus Christ, and the afflicted family followed the same example of their head. The father died; Mastai closed his eyes; arrayed his body for the tomb in some of his own clothing; dug his grave with his own hands, and having laid him in it, planted upon it a wooden cross and a rose, saying to his family, "When this cross shall be decayed or lost, replace it by another, for it is the symbol of salvation through Jesus Christ, and when you find evil passions getting the better of your good resolutions, come hither to pray for strength and aid. Never deny the God in whose name you have been baptized, and better thoughts and feelings will grow up in your hearts, even as this rose which I have planted will bloom and flourish upon the grave of him you love." He left the place with a light purse, but carrying with him the benedictions of the widow and the orphans.

At his return to Rome, his friend Pius VII., was no more, but Leo XII., constituted him prelate, and president of the great Ospizio de San Michele, the most considerable in Rome. He was afterwards made first pastor of Spoleto, and in 1832, under the pontificate of Gregory XVI., successor of Leo XII., bishop of Imola, a place of more importance.

His conduct in this new position, corresponded with that of his past life. His charities were so numerous as to attract an attention which he was sedulous to avoid. When his purse was exhausted as it frequently was, he gave his clothing, or even sold articles of furniture, rather than refuse application for relief. This was often done so privately, that his steward or major-domo was in distress lest some thief had found secret access to the money chest. "I left fifty scudi yesterday, to-day I have not a baiocco for the market."

"It is I who am the thief."

"But the dinner?"

"Give me porridge," was the reply.

This is only a specimen of M. Balleydier's rapturous stories of the goodness of Pio Nono, but it serves as well as the whole, to show what is at least the popular idea of his benevolence.

We will give an anecdote of which the theme is a little different.

Being at Rome, assisting in the ceremonies of Holy week, cardinal Mastai was listening to a celebrated preacher, who discoursed with great animation on the passion of our Lord. In the very height of his eloquence, the preacher was seized with a hoarseness so severe, that he could not make himself heard, and he was obliged to retire to the sacristy, covered with distress and mortification. Cardinal Mastai, who was presiding, immediately left his seat, and taking his place in the pulpit, resumed the thread of the discourse where the orator had dropped it, and for more than an hour kept the audience enchained by the passionate energy of his manner, and the earnestness of his exhortations. On being complimented upon his facility, he replied, "I had previously heard the discourse of my friend, and only regret that I could not have done more justice to his truly excellent thoughts."

He was in the discharge of his duties as bishop of Imola, when he received news of the death of Gregory XVI., with a requisition for his immediate presence in the conclave which was to choose his successor. When afterwards he was informed that he had been elected to this high office, he burst into tears, and had nearly fallen from his seat. Then recovering himself, he said, "I am the sworn servant of Jesus Christ, I submit myself to the will of God." The choice was doubtless a surprise to him, for although he was finally elected with acclamation, there had been close and repeated voting, which seemed likely to result in the election of one of three other cardinals.

The Roman people had felt much uneasiness during the delays and disappointment which preceded the choice of cardinal Mastai, for they were justly fearful of the powerful Austrian influence which was known to be at work in Rome, and which would be put in force to place in the pontifical chair, one of the cardinals devoted to the interests of that country. Crowds watched the quirinal while the conclave was sitting. Twice a day the cardinal commissioners, to whom was entrusted the care of the election, counted the votes, and not finding two thirds cast for any one candidate, burned the sealed papers, in which the suffrages were inclosed, on a silver plate, so arranged that the smoke ascending through a sort of chimney, should be seen by the people without. At each repetition of this ceremony popularly called the fumata, the spirits of the crowd sunk, and despairing murmurs arose. But at length after an ominous stillness, the sound of a hammer was heard in that walled-up window in the palace, through which the announcement of a new pope, must be given to the Roman people. The choice was made; the crowd stood breathless; a single stone fell on the balcony; the strokes were repeated and the aperture soon became large enough to permit the cardinal-chamberlain to pass through it. The multitude hailed the sight with one universal shout. "Romans," said the official, as soon as he could be heard. "I bring you joyful tidings.—We have a pope—cardinal Giovanni Mastai Ferretti, bishop of Imola, who takes the name of Pius IX." This notice having been given in Latin, the chamberlain, threw among the crowd a paper on which the same announcement was written in the Italian language, and the good news was speedily flying on the wings of the wind to every quarter of the city. The cannon of St. Angelo, the bells of St. Peters, and of all Rome's three hundred churches, sounded forth gladness. The community received the intelligence with tears of joy, for the character of the bishop of Imola was well known to them. The ceremonies attendant upon his consecration, and enthronization, were splendid in the extreme; and his pastoral visits to the adjacent towns, had each the character of a triumph, until he adopted the precaution of sending beforehand a special order and personal request that the expensive honours with which his people were wont to receive him, should be forborne, as being contrary at once to his wishes and to his principles. His habits are extremely simple, and he has been constantly making reforms in the expenditures of the palace and of the Government; many abuses having crept in during the miserable administration of Gregory XVI.

His first public act of importance was the decree of amnesty, which at once made him the idol of the Italian heart. This document, which is given at full length by our enraptured biographer, is certainly conceived in a most generous and fatherly spirit. The pope begins by saying that the rejoicings of his people on his accession, otherwise so gratifying, were saddened by the recollection that not a few families among his affectionate subjects were suffering from the absence of beloved members, who had been banished for offences against law and good order. He speaks of the transgression as owing in most cases to the heat of youth, and declares that the regard expressed by the people, is to him a sufficient guarantee that he may, without peril to the State, offer a free pardon to all such as are willing to promise obedience to his Government. He desires that the first act of his pontificate should be one of love and mercy. The conditions are then enumerated, and they are of the kindest and most reasonable tone. All legal proceedings against the offenders are stopped, while at the same time those who desire to clear themselves by a judicial investigation, are at liberty to do so. The paper concludes with an appeal to the honour and to the better feeling of those who accept this pardon, and a gentle hint of the course which will become the duty of the government, in case of ungenerous abuse of the pope's clemency. Perhaps no act of amnesty was ever more nobly conceived.

This act of the pope was violently opposed by several of the cardinals. They prophesied anarchy, radicalism, disorder of all sorts. After it was passed one of them said to the pope,—"Your holiness see how it is; the hot heads are already throwing tricoloured cockades about the streets."

"Are they so?" said the pope, "then they certainly do not mean to wear them."

The quiet humour of Pio Nono often serves him a good turn among the factious and discontented spirits with whom he has to deal. Many anecdotes are current, showing that he knows how good-humouredly to turn off an ill-natured suggestion, or to hint a reproof. The reply he made to some young men, who having subscribed largely to present a crown of silver laural to Fanny Elisler, asked his opinion of the offering, is an instance: "Truly," said he, "I am but a poor priest, and cannot pretend to be a judge of these things, but it seems to me, that a crown is for the head and not for the legs."

That he is a man who sincerely believes religion and its duties to be the one thing needful, and who really strives to make it so in his own practice, it is hard to doubt; thas he is a devoted Catholic, is equally certain. He has received all his ideas of religion through the medium of the church, and seems honestly to believe in her infallibility. He dreads Bible Societies, and all other institutions which suppose the right of private judgment in matters of faith, while on subjects unconnected with religion, he is a person of remarkable liberality.—His sympathy with suffering of every sort, is acknowleged by all to be of the tenderest kind, and his generosity in giving knows no limit, but the extent of his means. He gives the most minute attention to all matters affecting the public convenience; has granted liberty of the press, and popular representation; has introduced valuable reforms into the practice of the courts of law; examined into the cases of persons imprisoned for long periods, and relieving them where he thought himself justified in so doing. He opens all letters addressed to him with his own hands, and no complaint, whether of public or private wrong, is ever treated by him with neglect. It is even said that he sometimes goes out incog., that he may see for himself the course of things in Rome, but this is probably a figment; for a face that is stamped upon standards, medals, coins, marbles, pocket-handkerchiefs,—could never be disguised from any Roman.

His subjects certainly look to him with filial affection, and expect from him the kindness of a father. Their complaints of him relate to his want of sufficiently bold and vindictive spirit against Austria. In the present boiling state of Italian politics, nothing short of war to the knife, will content the fierce portion of the people, and Pio Nono has evidently as little liking for war as any follower of William Penn. This is called weakness, and the very people who drew his carriage with their own hands, and almost deified him after the act of amnesty, are now ready to shut him up in the castle of St. Angelo, and even to depose him, if he hesitates as to a final rupture with Austria. The pope, no doubt, finds himself in a very disagreeable position, and his benevolent, and even handsome face, bears marks of anxious care and perplexity. If the Italian patriots compass all that they wish, either a republic will be established, or Carlo Alberto will be king of all Italy—the latter, far the most probable on every account. In either case the pope's temporal power is gone, and although he is said, in the beginning of his reign, to have expressed himself ready and willing to relinquish it, he has probably, ere this, come to a different way of thinking. His position is full of anomalies and difficulties which must be exceedingly trying to a conscientious man; such as we have no doubt he is. Some of his acts, and most of his sentiments, have caused him to be considered in Europe, as a leader of the liberals of the age; but when his liberal sentiments are constructed as pledging him to a very destructive and very doubtful war with Austria, he shrinks and desires to be excused, which instantly raises against him the cry of—"Treason against Liberty." Nothing can be more perplexed than the web of Italian politics, and we sometimes fear the pope, with all his excellent qualities, is doomed to be the victim in some shape, of the spirit of the times. No one can see and hear him without feeling a warm interest in him, and we should certainly hear of any misfortune happening to him with the most sincere regret.

## THE HOLY LAND—JACOB'S WELL AND THE SAMARITANS.

Our last view of Jerusalem was very fine. We looked back from a ridge on the northern road, and saw it lying, bright and stately, on its everlasting hills; but it looked lower than from most other points of view, from Moab mountains forming its lofty back-ground. We descended the slope before us, and lost sight of the Holy City forever.

Again we were struck with the vivid colouring of the scenery. All this day the hills were dressed in brilliant hues—the soil red, grey, and brown; the tilled portions of the brightest green, and the shadows purple or lilac. All the hills show traces of having been once terraced; and they were still completely so in the neighbourhood of our encampment, this evening—the terraces follow the strata of the stone, which all lay slanting. This gives a singular air of wildness to the most cultivated spots. Here and there were basins among the hills, the red soil dropped all over with fig and olive trees, or full of corn; and the upland tracks winding among slopes all strewn with cistus, iris, cyclamen, and anemones, and bristling with tall flowering hollyhocks. On we went, past deep old wells yawning in the hollows, or stone cisterns where the cattle were crowding to drink; past a few camels here and there, browsing in the dells; past groups of Arabs with their asses, carrying corn to the city; past stone villages crowning the steeps, till, at 6. P. M., we encamped beside a beautiful old pool. We were under the shelter of a rock, whose moist crevices were fringed with delicate ferns. While dinner was preparing, I went back on our road—the narrow stony road which wound round the verdant promontory opposite our rock—to find a honeysuckle which I had seen climbing and blossoming to a great height; and I brought back a charming handful of flowers.

While we were at dinner in the tent, a sound of scuffling was heard outside; and when our dragoman next entered, he was out of breath. We afterwards heard the whole story, and were amused to hear how zealous our Mahommedan servants could be in the cause of Christians. Some Arabs, with their loaded mules, had come with the intention of encamping beside the pool; and on finding the ground partly occupied, though there was plenty of room left, they became abusive, and wondered aloud what business these cursed Christians had in their country. Our dragoman resented this, and threw the speaker over the tent ropes. There was then a stout scuffle, and our cook coming to help, and the Arabs falling one upon another, over the tent pegs in the dark, they had the worst of it, and went off vowing vengeance. We heard no more of them, however.

The next morning we saw the Mediterranean, like a basin of deep blue water between two hills. We were not going toward it, however, but to Nablous, the ancient Sychar; where lies that Jacob's Well at which the woman of Samaria was wont to draw water.

Our road lay through a most fertile valley, now called Hawarrah, where the crops were splendid for miles; and the villages were thickly planted on the hills. The ground rose in a series of table lands, of which there was a succession of three when we were leaving the rich Hawarrah valley. The roads in this part of the Holy Land were mere lanes, full of stones, between walls, or tracks through olive grounds and meadows, or paths running along shelves of the rocks, with a bit of rocky staircase at each end, about ascending or descending which our good horses made no difficulty.

Before entering the valley where old Sychar lay, between the mountains Ebal and Gerizim, we came to the fine fertile parcel of ground which Jacob bought. The valley opens out into this wide basin; and near the junction of the valley and the basin is the old well which is the supposed scene of the conversation of Jesus with the Samaritan woman.—Some of our party wound round the base of the hill to the well; and some (and I for one) rode by the upper path, over the shoulder of the hill, and came down on the other side. I had thus a fine view of the whole locality of the valley where the city lies—a narrow valley, rich with fig and olive groves, and overhung by the rocky basis of Ebal and Gerizim, where the square block entrances of tombs dotted the strata of the rocks. From this height Jacob's land looked a beautiful expanse. The well is a mere rough heap of stones, with a hole in the middle, nearly closed up. What there is below ground, I cannot say; but this is all that is to be seen on the surface. It is not a well likely to be in use now, for there are many springs and hollow cisterns (though no well) between this and the town, which lies about a mile and a half off.

Everybody knows that the Jews had no friendly dealings with the Samaritans in the time of Jesus. The quarrel had then lasted about five hundred years. How many suns had gone down upon their wrath! The Samaritans had wished to assist the Jews in rebuilding the temple at Jerusalem; but the Jews hated them as a mixed race, and would not admit that they had any right to share in temple worship, or any other Jewish privileges. It really was a most serious objection to the Samaritans, that they were a mixed race; because the intermarriages of the former Samaritan Israelites with Assyrians and others disposed them to idolatry, or at least to a worship as mixed as their race. So the Samaritans were excluded from the rebuilding of the temple, about five hundred years B. C. And not being permitted to help, they did all they could to hinder. About one hundred years after, they obtained leave of the Persian court, (to which both the Jews and they were subject,) to build a second temple to Jehovah; and they built it on Mount Gerizim. This was a shocking impiety in the sight of the Jews; and it was the occasion of a number of lax-minded Jews, who had broken the law by marrying heathen wives, or otherwise, and who yet wished to worship Jehovah in his temple, resorting to Sychar, to join the Samaritans, and render their race yet more mixed. This was the quarrel which the woman of Samaria referred to when she spoke of the question whether "men ought to worship in this mountain or in Jerusalem?" and thus is explained her wonder that Jesus, being a Jew, should ask water of her, who was a Samaritan. There was a quarrel about their Scriptures; the Jews insisting to this day, that the Samaritans had altered two or three texts, relating to these two mountains, Ebal and Gerizim, in their own sacred copy of the books of Moses; the Samaritans insisting, of course, that theirs was the true copy.

From my early youth, I had always taken a strong interest in this old quarrel, feeling sympathy with both parties, and a keen delight in the wise and soothing words of Jesus concerning it. What a truth it was for both parties to hear, that God was now to be worshipped everywhere; and that all *places* were henceforth to be as sacred as the Jerusalem temple, or the mountain at Sychar! And what a lesson in liberality it was to the Jews, when he gave honour to the Samaritan parable, on account of his good works, above the sacred priest and the servant of the temple at Jerusalem. Both parties were, of course, wrong in their fierce anger; but each had much to plead on his own side. The Jews were bound to keep their race and worship pure; and held, as an essential matter of faith, that Jehovah would have but one dwelling-place; which was their view of their temple. And the Samaritans were surely right in persisting in their endeavour to worship Jehovah, in accordance with the law of Moses, as they did not believe in strange gods and if the Jews could not admit them to worship in the temple at Jerusalem, they could not be blamed for building one for themselves.

Such was always my view of the matter; and therefore it was with indescribable interest that I looked this day upon Mount Gerizim, and remembered that somewhere in the city we were approaching, was treasured that sacred copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch (Books of Moses), which the possessors believe to be the true one, and to be 3500 years old. The most learned men among the Christians do not believe it to be nearly so old as that; but they have a high opinion of its value, and would follow it sooner than any other, I believe, excepting instances where the disputed texts about Ebal and Gerizim are concerned.

The present inhabitants of the city hate the Christians as heartily as the old inhabitants used to hate the Jews. The inhabitants are Mahommedans of a most bigoted character; and they would admit neither Jews nor Christians within their gates till within a few years, when the Government of the country (then Egyptian) compelled them to better manners. They dared not refuse us admission: but they behaved with great insolence. We had to ride from end to end of the city, our tents being pitched on a green on the other side. Our horses had to go as slowly as possible through the narrow street, which would not hold two abreast, and was paved with large slippery stones. As we rode along one behind another, at this funeral pace, all the people came out to stare, and some to mock. Three times things were thrown in my face; men and women laughed and sneered, and children thrust out their tongues. I felt what a lesson this was to intolerance about matters of opinion. And thus it is, but too often, in the streets of other cities, where men ought to know better than to despise each other for worshipping the same God, in a different manner. In the streets of other cities, men take upon themselves to pity and despise one another, with no better knowledge, in reality, of one another's views and feelings, than these Mahommedans had of ours, or we of theirs.

At last we were through! and glad I was to issue from the gate at the farther end. But a sad sight awaited us there. A company of lepers were under the trees, crying out to us for charity, and stretching out their maimed hands. It is a terrible sight, which we see too often in that country. It saddened us at Jerusalem almost every day.

Our tents were pitched on a weedy plot of ground, among gardens, orchards, and rippling streams, and looking up to Ebal on the one side, and Gerizim on the other. Ebal is still the sterner mountain of the two, but Gerizim has lost much of its fertility.—Both have tombs and votive buildings on them, which show them to have been places of pilgrimage.

After dinner, we ascended a height, past the Mohammedan cemetary, whence we had a fine view, in the last sunlight, of this most beautiful city. It was once the capital of Samaria; and it is still, and must ever be, for its situation, a very striking place. It completely fills the valley, from side to side, and ascends a little way up the skirts of Gerizim. Its houses, with their flat white roofs, are hedged in by the groves which surround the town; vines spread from roof to roof, and from court to court; two or three palms spring up in the midst, and higher aloft still, a graceful minaret here and there.

Then, to my delight, we descended to seek the Samaritan synagogue. We were guided to it, and I saw nearly all the Samaritans of the place; good looking people, the men wearing the high helm-like turban, which we see in the portraits of Josephus and other old Jews. They said their number was sixty in this place, and about forty more elsewhere; only a hundred in the whole world. They declared their chief priest and the rest of their sect to be at Genoa. They keep three great feasts in the year, going up to Gerizim as the Jews used to go up to the temple.

The synagogue was a small ordinary looking chapel, within a curtained recess of which is kept the old copy of the Pentateuch. It was shown to us, after much entreaty on our part; but I found it was impossible that I could be allowed to touch it.

I felt it a great event to have seen it. It is written on a sort of vellum, in the Samaritan text, clear, small, and even. The vellum is tattered; but it is well mounted on parchment. The priest himself dares not touch the MS., without careful purification; and he holds it by the ends of the rollers on which it is fixed on a scroll, like the copies of the Jewish law in synagogues.

We were lighted through the archways of the street on our way home, and down the hill, by a single candle, which burned steadily in the still air.

Our employment this evening was reading aloud the history of the Jewish and Samaritan controversy, and the fourth chapter of the Gospel of John.—While we were thus reading in our tent, the jackal was in full cry on the slopes of Gerizim.—*H. Martineau.*

## LITERARY RELICS.

The universal reverence entertained for men of genius causes their residences and every little thing belonging to them to be regarded with an unusual degree of interest. Hence it is that relics of them—their autographs, pens, snuff-boxes, and other articles—are so eagerly sought after, and so highly prized. The neighbourhoods in which they dwelt are wandered through with greater delight than others more beautiful or striking, but not so renowned. "There is a charm," as Washington Irving observes "about the spot which has been printed by the footsteps of departed beauty, and consecrated by the inspirations of the poet, which is heightened rather than impaired by the lapse of ages. It is indeed the gift of poetry to hallow every place in which it moves, to breath round nature an odor more exquisite than the perfume of the rose, and to shed over it a tint more magical than the blush of the morning."

In the park at Penhurst Castle, Kent, stands a famous oak, said to have been planted at the birth of Sir Philip Sidney.

In the grounds of Abbington Abbey, Northamptonshire, stands Garrick's mulberry-tree, with this inscription upon copper attached to one of its limbs: "This tree was planted by David Garrick, Esq., at the request of Ann Thursby, as a growing testimony of their friendship, 1778."

Henry Kirk White's favourite tree whereon he had cut "H. T. W., 1805," stood on the sands at Whitton, in Northumberland, until it was cut down by the woodman's axe; but in veneration for the poet's memory the portion bearing his initials was carefully preserved in an elegant gilt frame.

An English traveller desirious of possessing a memorial of Madame de Sevigne, purchased for the sum of 18,000 francs, the staircase of her chateau at Provence.

Sir Isaac Newton's solar dial, which was cut in stone, and attached to the manor-house at Woolsthrop, Lincolnshire, is now placed in the Royal Society's collection.

Some years ago a curious arm-chair, which had belonged to Gay, the poet, was sold at public auction at Barnstable, his native place. It contained a draw under the seat, at the extremity of which was a smaller draw, connected with a rod in front, by which it was drawn out.

Benjamin Franklin's "fine crab-tree walking stick, with a gold head curiously wrought in the form of a cap of liberty;" is bequeathed in a codicil to his will, "to the friend of mankind, General Washington;" adding that "if it were a sceptre, he had merited it, and would become it." It is now the property of the United States and is preserved in the great hall of the Patent-Office, at Washington.

Thorpe's Catalogue of Autographs" [1843] includes a letter from a Miss Smith of Arundale, forwarding to the Earl of Buchan, "a chip taken from the coffin of the poet Burns, when his body was removed from his first grave to the mausoleum, erected to his memory in St. Michael's churchyard Dumfries."

The tower of Montbard, in Burgundy, was Buffon's study, and together with the garden in which the great naturalist used to recreate himself is religiously kept up by the inhabitants.

Pope's house at Binfield has been pulled down; but the poet's parlor still exists as a portion of the present mansion erected on the spot. A patch of the great forest near Binfield has been honourably preserved, under the name of Pope's Wood. His house in Twickenham is gone, the garden is bare; but the celebrated grotto remains, strict, however, of all that gave it picturesqueness, grace, and beauty.

Cowper's house at Onley, is still standing in the same ruinous state so humorously described by the poet; his parlor is occupied as a girl's school.

The summer-house in the garden, wherein he used to sit conning his verses, also remains, its walls covered with visitors' names. His residence in the neighbouring village of Weston has been much altered, but is still beautiful with a profusion of roses in front.

Goldsmith's cottage at Kilburn, wherein he wrote the "Vicar of Wakefield and the "Deserted Village," was pulled down a few years since to make way for new buildings.

DYER AND CHARLES LAMB.—No contrast could be more vivid than that presented by the relations of each to the literature they both loved; one divining its inmost essences, plucking out the heart of its mysteries, shedding light on its dimmest recesses; the other devoted with equal assiduity to externals. Books, to Dyer, were a real world, both pure and good; among them he passed, unconscious of time, from youth to extreme age, vegetating on their dates and forms, and "trivial fond records," in the learned air of great libraries, or the dusty confusion of his own, with the least possible apprehension of any human interest vital in their pages, or of any spirit of wit or fancy glancing across them. His life was an Academic Pastoral. Methinks I see his gaunt, awkward form, set off by trowsers too short, like those outgrown by a gawky lad, and a rusty coat as much too large for the wearer, hanging about him like those garments which the aristocratic Milesian peasantry prefer to the most comfortable rustic dress; his long head silvered over with short wet straggling hair, and dark grey eyes glistening with faith and wonder, as Lamb satisfies the curiosity which has gently disturbed his studies as to the authorship of the Waverly Novels by telling him, in the strictest confidence, that they are the works of Lord Castlereagh, just returned from the Congress of Sovereigns of Vienna! Off he runs, with animated stride and shambling enthusiasm, nor stops till he reaches Maida Hall, and breathes his news into the ear of Leigh Hunt, who, "as a public writer," ought to be possessed of the great fact with which George is laden! Or shall I endeavour to revive the bewildered look with which, just after he had been announced one of Lord Stanhope's executors and residuary legatees, he received Lamb's grave inquiry, "Whether it was true, as commonly reported, that he was to be made a lord?" "O dear no! Mr. Lamb," responded he with earnest seriousness, but not without a moment's quivering vanity, "I could not think of such a thing; it is not true, I assure you." "I thought not," said Lamb, "and I contradict it wherever I go; but the Government will not ask you consent; they may raise your to the peerage without your even knowing it." "I hope not, Mr. Lamb; indeed, indeed, I hope not; it would not suit me at all," responded Dyer, and went his way, musing on the possibility of a strange honour descending on his reluctant brow. Or shall I recall the visible presentiment of his bland unconsciousness of evil when his sportive friend taxed it to the utmost, by suddenly asking what he thought of the murderer Williams, who, after destroying two families in Ratcliffe Highway, had broken prison by suicide, and whose body had just before been conveyed in shocking procession to its cross-road grave! The desperate attempt to compel the gentle optimist to speak ill of a mortal creature produced no happier success than the answer, "Why, I should think, Mr. Lamb, he must have been rather an eccentric character." This simplicity of a nature not only unspotted by the world, but almost abstracted from it, will seem the more remarkable, when it is known that it was subjected, at the entrance of life, to a hard battle with fortune. Dyer was the son of very poor parents, residing in an eastern suburb of London, Stepney or Bethnel-greenward, where he attracted the attention of two elderly ladies as a serious child, with an extraordinary love for books. They obtained for him a presentation to Christ's Hospital, which he entered at seven years of age; fought his way through its sturdy ranks to its head; and, at nineteen, quitted it for Cambridge, with only an exhibition and his scholarly accomplishments to help him. On he went, however, placid if not rejoicing, through the difficulties of a life illustrated only by scholarship; encountering tremendous labours; unresting yet serene; until at eighty-five he breathed out the most blameless of lives, which began in a struggle to end in a learned dream!—*Memorials of Lamb, and Sketches of his Companions: by T. M. Talfourd.*

## Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

"I never complained of my condition," said the Persian poet Sadi, "but once, when my feet were bare, and I had no money to buy shoes; but then I met a man without feet, and I became contented with my lot."

"How speedily," observes Dr. Knox, "does the Anglo-Saxon show his real character when relieved from the pressure of the Three Estates. In America he will not allow a black man to be a free man; in Australia he deems him entirely below his notice; in Tasmania he swept him, and at once, entirely from the land of his birth."

MANGLING DONE HERE.—The Railway Companies have again been indulging the public with a short series of their frightful accidents. Granting acts to convey persons and goods is one thing, granting licences to mangle is quite another; yet these Railways, considering that they are without licence for the latter of these two businesses, have certainly carried on mangling to some extent. In the fourth and fifth rate streets of the Metropolis are to be seen, plentiful as blackberries, small boards announcing "Mangling done here." We would have our Railroad managers beware, or some dealer in practical jokes might, possibly, be tempted by night to affix these one of these sign boards to each of their London Stations.—*London Satyrist*

JUNIUS AND GARRICK.—Junius had warned Woodfall to beware of Garrick; but Woodfall imprudently told Garrick; in confidence, that Junius would probably cease to write. Garrick immediately hurried with the information to Ramus, one of the royal pages, and Ramus, without a moment's delay, conveyed it to the king, who was then residing at Richmond. *Within twelve hours* Woodfall received a note from Junius with the following postcript: "Beware of David Garrick. He was sent to pump, and went directly, to Richmond to tell the king I should write no more." Shortly afterwards he penned the following extraordinary epistle to Garrick which, however, was never forwarded:—"I am very exactly informed of your impertinent inquiries, and of the information you so busily sent to Richmond, and with what triumph and exultation it was received. I knew every particular of it the next day. Now mark me, v